

8174  
1,980  
op. 2

ANNUAL REPORT  
OF THE  
**BOARD OF CORRECTIONS**  
AND THE  
COMMISSIONER  
OF THE  
SOUTH CAROLINA  
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS  
FOR THE  
PERIOD JULY 1, 1979 TO JUNE 30, 1980



S. C. STATE LIBRARY  
APR 22 1981  
STATE DOCUMENTS

PRINTED UNDER THE DIRECTION OF THE  
STATE BUDGET AND CONTROL BOARD

ANNUAL REPORT  
OF THE  
**BOARD OF CORRECTIONS**  
AND THE  
COMMISSIONER  
OF THE  
SOUTH CAROLINA  
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS  
FOR THE  
PERIOD JULY 1, 1979 TO JUNE 30, 1980



PRINTED UNDER THE DIRECTION OF THE  
STATE BUDGET AND CONTROL BOARD

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
South Carolina State Board of Corrections .....	8
Directory of Key Administrators .....	9
Organization of the South Carolina Department of Corrections	13
Facilities of the South Carolina Department of Corrections ..	16
Historical Perspective .....	21
Significant Developments of FY 1980 .....	25
Population Flows and Statistics .....	25
Complete Regionalization of SCDC Facilities .....	29
Ten Year Capital Improvements Plan .....	29
Renovations of SCDC Facilities .....	33
Preparations for Administering the Death Penalty .....	34
Budget Deficit in FY 1980 .....	35
Earned Work Credit Program (EWCP) .....	35
Extended Work Release Program .....	38
Victim Restitution Project .....	39
Long-range Planning for Alternatives to Incarceration ..	39
Simplified Computation of Inmate Good Time Credits ..	40
Inmate Classification .....	41
Recognition of the Youthful Offender Parole Program ..	42
Health Services Delivery .....	43
Human Services Programs .....	44
Prison Industries .....	45
Agricultural Production .....	48
Personnel Administration and Staff Development .....	50
Expanded Utilization of Automated Information Systems	51
Word Processing Center .....	53
KCI Inmate Program Won International Award .....	53

## TABLE OF CONTENTS—Continued

	PAGE
Federal Assistance Being Received by or Approved for the South Carolina Department of Corrections During FY 1980 .....	55
Publications/Documents of the South Carolina Department of Corrections .....	59
Statistical Section .....	61
Appendix .....	136
A. Statutory Authority of the South Carolina Department of Corrections .....	137
B. Youthful Offender Act .....	138
C. Programs and Services Administered by the South Carolina Department of Corrections .....	139
D. Counties Comprising South Carolina Planning Districts and Correctional Regions .....	140
E. Counties Comprising South Carolina Judicial Circuits	141



## TABLES AND FIGURES

TABLE NUMBER	PAGE
1 Institutions and Centers of the South Carolina Department of Corrections, as of June 30, 1980 .....	18
2 SCDC Average Inmate Population, Calendar Years 1960-1980 .....	62
3 SCDC Average Inmate Population, Fiscal Years 1967-1980 .....	64
4 Per Inmate Costs of the South Carolina Department of Corrections, Fiscal Years 1973-1980 .....	66
5 Expenditures of the South Carolina Department of Corrections, FY 1980 .....	67
6 Flow of Offenders Through the South Carolina Department of Corrections, Fiscal Years 1979-1980 ....	68
7 Distribution by Committing County and Correctional Region of SCDC Inmates Admitted During FY 1980	71
8 Offense Distribution of SCDC Inmates Admitted During FY 1980 .....	74
9 Most Serious Offense of SCDC Inmates Admitted During FY 1980 .....	77
10 Sentence Length Distribution of SCDC Inmates Admitted During FY 1980 .....	80
11 Age Distribution of SCDC Inmates Admitted During FY 1980 .....	82
12 Distribution by Committing Planning Districts of SCDC Inmates Admitted During FY 1980 .....	84
13 Distribution by Committing Judicial Circuits of SCDC Inmates Admitted During FY 1980 .....	86
14 Distribution by Committing County and Correctional Region of SCDC Total Inmate Population, As of June 28, 1980 .....	89
15 Type of Offense Distribution of SCDC Total Inmate Population, As of June 28, 1980 .....	92
16 Most Serious Offense Distribution of SCDC Total Inmate Population, As of June 28, 1980 .....	95

## TABLES AND FIGURES—Continued

TABLE NUMBER	PAGE
17 Sentence Length Distribution of SCDC Total Inmate Population, As of June 28, 1980 .....	98
18 Age Distribution of SCDC Total Inmate Population, As of June 28, 1980 .....	100
19 Age at Time of Admission of SCDC Total Inmate Population, As of June 28, 1980 .....	102
20 Custody Grade Distribution by Committing Correctional Region, Race and Sex of SCDC Total Inmate Population, As of June 28, 1980 .....	105
21 Committing Planning Districts of SCDC Total Inmate Population, As of June 28, 1980 .....	108
22 Committing Judicial Circuits of SCDC Total Inmate Population, As of June 28, 1980 .....	110
23 Remaining Time to Serve of SCDC Total Inmate Population, As of June 28, 1980 .....	112
24 Distribution of Time Served by SCDC Inmates Released During FY 1980 .....	114
25 Distribution of Inmates and Work Credits Earned by Type of Release and Time Served of Inmates Released During FY 1980 (July 1, 1979 - June 30, 1980) .....	116
26 Distribution by Work Credits Earned and Type of Release of SCDC Inmates Released During FY 1980 (July 1, 1979 - June 30, 1980) .....	118
27 Distribution of Average Daily Number of Inmates and Total Earned Work Credits by Job Assignment During FY 1980 .....	119
28 Parole Board Action During FY 1980 .....	128
29 Community Program Statistics, FY 1980 .....	130
30 Youthful Offender Statistics, Fiscal Years 1979-1980 ..	131
31 Distribution of SCDC Personnel by Race and Sex, As of June 19, 1980 .....	132
32 Distribution of SCDC Security Strength by Facility, As of June 19, 1980 .....	133

## TABLES AND FIGURES—Continued

FIGURE NUMBER	PAGE
1 Organizational Structure, South Carolina Department of Corrections .....	12
2 Locations of SCDC Institutions and Centers, As of June 30, 1980 .....	20
3 SCDC Average Inmate Population, Calendar Years 1960-1980 .....	63
4 SCDC Average Inmate Population, Fiscal Years 1967-1980 .....	65
5 Annual Per Inmate Costs of SCDC, FY 1973-1980 ..	66
6 Race and Sex of SCDC Inmates Admitted During FY 1980 .....	70
7 Inmate Admissions by Committing County and Correctional Region During FY 1980 .....	73
8 Offenses of SCDC Inmates Admitted During FY 1980	76
9 Most Serious Offense of SCDC Inmates Admitted During FY 1980 .....	79
10 Sentence Lengths of SCDC Inmates Admitted During FY 1980 .....	81
11 Age Groups of SCDC Inmates Admitted During FY 1980 .....	83
12 Committing Planning Districts of SCDC Inmates Admitted During FY 1980 .....	85
13 Committing Judicial Circuits of SCDC Inmates Admitted During FY 1980 .....	87
14 Race and Sex of SCDC Inmates, As of June 28, 1980	88
15 Committing Correctional Region of SCDC Inmate Population, As of June 28, 1980 .....	91
16 Offenses of SCDC Total Inmate Population, As of June 28, 1980 .....	94
17 Most Serious Offense of SCDC Total Inmate Population, As of June 28, 1980 .....	97

## TABLES AND FIGURES—Continued

FIGURE NUMBER	PAGE
18 Sentence Lengths of SCDC Total Inmate Population, As of June 28, 1980 .....	99
19 Age Groups of SCDC Total Inmate Population, As of June 28, 1980 .....	101
20 Age at Time of Admission of SCDC Total Inmate Population, As of June 28, 1980 .....	103
21 Location of SCDC Inmates, As of June 28, 1980 ....	104
22 Custody Grades of SCDC Total Inmate Population, As of June 28, 1980 .....	107
23 Committing Planning Districts of SCDC Total Inmate Population, As of June 28, 1980 .....	109
24 Committing Judicial Circuits of SCDC Total Inmate Population, As of June 28, 1980 .....	111
25 Remaining Time to Serve of SCDC Total Inmate Population, As of June 28, 1980 .....	113
26 Time Served by SCDC Inmates Released During FY 1980 .....	115
27 Average Time Served by SCDC Inmates Released During FY 1980 .....	117
28 Percentage of SCDC Inmates Granted Parole by Quarter (January, 1977 - June, 1980) .....	129
29 SCDC Personnel by Race, Sex and Type of Position, As of June 19, 1980 .....	132

## **SOUTH CAROLINA STATE BOARD OF CORRECTIONS**

**Governor Richard W. Riley, *Ex Officio***

***Chairman*, Mr. Eugene N. Zeigler ..... Florence**

***Vice-Chairman*, Mr. Norman Kirkland ..... Bamberg**

***Secretary*, Mr. W. M. Cromley, Jr. .... Saluda**

***Member*, Mrs. Betty M. Condon ..... Mt. Pleasant**

***Member*, Mr. Charles C. Moore ..... Spartanburg**

***Member*, Mr. Clarence E. Watkins ..... Camden**

## DIRECTORY OF KEY ADMINISTRATORS \*

### Headquarters

Commissioner .....	William D. Leeke
Executive Assistant .....	Sterling W. Beckman
Administrative Assistant .....	Sandra Jeffcoat
Assistant for Special Projects .....	Joann B. Morton
Director, Division of Public Information .....	Sam E. McCuen
Legal Advisor .....	Larry C. Batson
Director, Division of Internal Affairs and Inspections .....	John W. Liddle
Director, Division of Inmate Relations .....	Janice M. Foy
Deputy Commissioner for Administration .....	Hubert M. Clements
Director, Division of Industries .....	John A. Carullo
Director, Division of Support Services .....	Fred A. Atkinson
Director, Division of Personnel Administration and Training .....	Joseph F. Kerenick
Director, Division of Resource and Information Management .....	John F. Kososki
Deputy Commissioner for Operations .....	Charles A. Leath
Assistant Deputy Commissioner for Institutions .....	Jesse W. Strickland
Director, Division of Construction .....	Nelson W. Meek
Director, Division of Engineering and Maintenance .....	Harry W. Oberlies
Deputy Commissioner for Program Services .....	Paul I. Weldon
Director, Division of Classification and Community Services .....	David I. Morgan
Director, Division of Human Services .....	William J. Deemer
Director, Division of Health Services .....	John P. Solomon

---

\* As of June 30, 1980.



## Correctional Facilities

### Appalachian Correctional Region

Regional Administrator ..... William D. Catoe  
Appalachian Reception and Evaluation Center,  
Warden ..... Frank H. Horton, Jr.  
Blue Ridge Pre-Release/Work Release Center,  
Superintendent ..... R. H. Mauney  
Cherokee Correctional Center,  
Supervisor ..... Willie J. Bratton, Jr.  
Duncan Correctional Center,  
Supervisor ..... William C. Henderson  
Givens Youth Correction Center,  
Warden ..... John H. Carmichael, Jr.  
Greenwood Correctional Center, Warden ..... Glenn T. Davis  
Hillcrest Correctional Center, Warden ..... Frank H. Horton, Jr.  
Laurens Correctional Center, Warden ..... Glenn T. Davis  
Northside Correctional Center, Warden ..... John Hatfield  
Oaklawn Correctional Center, Warden ..... Ronald L. Hamby  
Piedmont Work Release Center, Superintendent John R. Lark  
Travelers Rest Correctional Center,  
Supervisor ..... Fred J. Smith

### Midlands Correctional Region

Regional Administrator ..... Blake E. Taylor, Jr.  
Aiken Youth Correction Center, Warden ..... R. Brien Ward  
Campbell Work Release Center,  
Superintendent ..... Olin L. Turner  
Catawba Work Release Center,  
Superintendent ..... Norma P. Johnson  
Central Correctional Institution, Warden ..... Joe R. Martin  
Employment Program Dorm, Warden ..... Judy C. Anderson  
Goodman Correctional Institution,  
Warden ..... Judy C. Anderson  
Kirkland Correctional Institution,  
Warden ..... George N. Martin, III  
Lexington Correctional Center, Supervisor ..... R. K. Given  
Lower Savannah Work Release Center,  
Superintendent ..... George A. Roof  
Manning Correctional Institution,  
Warden ..... Kenneth D. McKellar  
Maximum Security Center, Warden ..... Louis M. Mims, Jr.




Midlands Reception and Evaluation Center,  
     Warden ..... Laurie F. Bessinger  
 Walden Correctional Institution, Warden ..... Willie R. Portee  
  
 Watkins Pre-Release Center,  
     Superintendent ..... Jerry D. Spigner  
 Women's Correctional Center, Warden ..... James E. Aiken  
 Women's Work Release Dormitory,  
     Superintendent ..... Judy C. Anderson  
  
 Coastal Correctional Region  
     Regional Administrator ..... L. J. Allen  
     Coastal Work Release Center, Superintendent ..... Frank A. Smith  
     MacDougall Youth Correction Center,  
         Superintendent ..... Edsel T. Taylor  
     Palmer Work Release Center,  
         Superintendent ..... Charles E. Grooms  
     Wateree River Correctional Institution,  
         Warden ..... J. Jerald Thames

FIGURE 1

South Carolina Department of Corrections  
Organizational Structure

July 15, 1980



## ORGANIZATION OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

The South Carolina Department of Corrections (SCDC) is the administrative agency of South Carolina state government responsible for providing food, shelter, health care, security and rehabilitation services to all adult offenders, age 17 and above, convicted of an offense against the State and sentenced to a period of incarceration exceeding three months. As of June 30, 1980, SCDC had custody over 8,176 incarcerated adult inmates, of whom 933 are serving an indeterminate sentence under the Youthful Offender Act.<sup>1</sup> This Act provides indeterminate sentences of one to six years for offenders between the ages of 17 and 21 (extended to 25 with offender consent), placing them under the Division of Classification and Community Services' Youthful Offender Branch. The Youthful Offender Program essentially operates as a micro-correctional system within the Department, providing all youthful offenders a complete range of administrative, evaluative, parole and aftercare services. There were 1,515 youthful offenders on parole and under SCDC supervision in the community as of June 30, 1980. Parole decisions pertaining to and the parole supervision of adult offenders are generally the responsibilities of the South Carolina Probation, Parole and Pardon Board except for those sentenced under the Youthful Offender Act.

SCDC is headed by a Commissioner who is responsible to the State Board of Corrections, a six-member board appointed by the Governor upon advice and consent of the Senate. The Governor also serves on the Board as an ex officio member. The Commissioner has overall responsibility for the agency, supervising all staff functions and ensuring that all departmental policies are practiced and maintained. Under the immediate supervision of the Office of the Commissioner are Special Projects, the Legal Advisor, and the Divisions of Public Information, Internal Affairs and Inspections, and Inmate Relations.

To assist the Commissioner in system operations and program administration are three offices headed by Deputy Commissioners and nine divisions supervised by Directors. These are described as follows:

The Office of the Deputy Commissioner for Administration has the major responsibility of coordinating all department-wide activities pertaining to resource and information management, industries, personnel administration and training, and support services.

---

<sup>1</sup> The provisions of this Act are summarized in Appendix B, page 138.

These four areas are individually the management responsibility of a division director, and a description of each is as follows:

1. The Division of Resource and Information Management encompasses the functions of planning, budgeting, statistical reporting and analysis, computer operations, system development and programming, offender records and financial accounting.
2. The Division of Personnel Administration and Training develops and administers departmental personnel policies and procedures, handles all personnel matters and develops and implements employee training programs at all levels to meet agency needs.
3. The Division of Industries administers a prison industry program consisting of several production lines and four farming operations. These programs/operations provide work for inmates to help defray the cost of upkeep, and produce goods for other state agencies, institutions and political subdivisions.
4. The Division of Support Services directs purchasing, canteen, commissary and food service functions of the agency.

The Office of the Deputy Commissioner for Operations is responsible for developing facility operating policies and procedures and coordinating their implementation; managing all security and state-wide logistical operations; and providing support for treatment/rehabilitative programs and services. This office also monitors activities involving the new construction, engineering and maintenance needs of SCDC facilities. Reporting to this office are the Assistant Deputy Commissioner for Institutions, the Division of Construction, and the Division of Engineering and Maintenance. The Division of Construction coordinates and supervises all construction projects in SCDC's Ten Year Capital Improvements Plan, while the Division of Engineering and Maintenance coordinates and supervises all major repairs and maintenance activities utilizing inmate labor. Three regional administrators, who are responsible for the direct supervision of SCDC facilities, report to the Assistant Deputy Commissioner for Institutions. The placement and movement of SCDC inmates to and from local facilities designated to hold state inmates are also the administrative responsibility of the Assistant Deputy Commissioner for Institutions.

The Office of the Deputy Commissioner for Program Services<sup>2</sup> is administratively responsible for defining, planning and developing

---

<sup>2</sup> For a list of programs and services administered by SCDC, see Appendix C, page 139.

an adequate program delivery system which will best meet the needs of the incarcerated. Delivering a broad spectrum of services under the supervision of this office are the Divisions of Classification and Community Services, Human Services, and Health Services. Services rendered by these divisions are described as follows:

1. The Division of Classification and Community Services implements standardized procedures for inmate classification, administers the youthful offender program as directed by the Youthful Offender Act, and supervises the placement of inmates in community programs, for example, the pre-release and work release programs, the Employment Program, and the Extended Work Release Program.
2. The Division of Human Services' field staff provides educational, psychological, social and specialized institutional services to inmates and its central administrative staff provides service coordination and acquires external resources to supplement SCDC's efforts.
3. The Division of Health Services renders medical, dental and psychiatric care to inmates through its medical staff and contractual agreements. It operates two infirmaries, one psychiatric unit and coordinates the placement of inmates at the State Park Health Center and community hospitals as needed.

Also included under the Office of the Deputy Commissioner for Program Services is a Program Development, Monitoring and Evaluation Unit which has the responsibility of service planning and tracking for individual inmates.

The aforementioned organizational structure of SCDC is illustrated in Figure 1, page 12.



## FACILITIES OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

While the Department has a central administrative structure, as described in the previous section, its facilities, widespread throughout the State, are aligned into correctional regions for management and operational efficiency. The three correctional regions in operation are Appalachian, Midlands, and Coastal. The geographical configuration of these regions is shown in Figure 2, page 20. Each of the correctional regions is administered by a regional administrator through a regional corrections coordinating office. The regional administrators are responsible to the Assistant Deputy Commissioner for Institutions.

At the end of FY 1980, the Department of Corrections operated a total of 32 facilities, which are individually listed in Table 1, pages 18 and 19. Figure 2, page 20 shows their location. Of these, eight are work release centers, one pre-release center, and one serving dually as a pre-release/work release center. Excluding the pre-release or work release centers, sixteen facilities house minimum security inmates, while the remaining six house medium or maximum security inmates. Four SCDC facilities are primarily for younger offenders, three of which predominantly house inmates sentenced under the Youthful Offender Act. Two SCDC institutions are for female inmates.

The total design capacity of these facilities at the end of FY 1980 was 4,606. Design capacity for individual facilities is shown in Table 1, pages 18 and 19. The regional distributions of the design capacity are as follows: Appalachian Correctional Region—783; Midlands Correctional Region—3,231; Coastal Correctional Region—592. The total average incarcerated inmate population under SCDC jurisdiction during FY 1980 was 7,869. Of these, 682 were housed in designated facilities, 132 were in the Extended Work Release Program in the community, and 52 were placed in non-SCDC locations.<sup>3</sup> Therefore, 7,003 inmates were housed in SCDC facilities, which were thus operating at 52 percent above design capacity.

Because of overcrowded conditions in SCDC institutions/centers, the Department has been housing state inmates in designated local facilities<sup>4</sup> since FY 1975, as provided for by legislation. At the end of FY 1980, 707 state inmates were held in designated

<sup>3</sup> These include the State Park Health Center, the State Law Enforcement Division, the Governor's Mansion and the Criminal Justice Academy.

<sup>4</sup> See FY 1975 and FY 1976 SCDC Annual Report for details of the origin of designated facilities.

local facilities in 40 counties. The average number of SCDC inmates held in designated county facilities during FY 1980 was 682 or 8.7 percent of the total average inmate population under SCDC custody.

Besides housing inmates in designated facilities because of overcrowded conditions, SCDC also placed certain inmates in other special locations because of their unique assignments or needs. A 31-bed unit of the State Park Health Center, administered and operated by the Department of Health and Environmental Control (DHEC), was renovated and designated to hold SCDC inmates undergoing and recuperating from general surgery. Whereas DHEC provides the professional services, SCDC is responsible for the security staffing and procedures. Other locations, where a small number of inmates are housed for special assignments, are the State Law Enforcement Division, the Governor's Mansion and the Criminal Justice Academy.



TABLE 1

# INSTITUTIONS AND CENTERS OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS AS OF JUNE 30, 1980

	Key to Location Map (Figure 2)	Degree of Security	Description of Resident Population	Design Capacity	Average Daily Population FY 1980	Avg. Daily Popul. as Percentage of Design Capacity
APPALACHIAN CORRECTIONAL REGION						
Appalachian Reception and Evaluation Center (AR&E)	2	Maximum	Male, ages 17 and up—inmates undergoing intake processing	90	104	115.6
Blue Ridge Pre-Release/Work Release Center (BRPR/WRC)	2	Minimum	Male, ages 17 and up—inmates on work release or accelerated pre-release	143	217	151.7
Cherokee Correctional Center (CCC)	7	Minimum	Male, ages 17 and up	56	71	126.8
Duncan Correctional Center (DCC)	5	Minimum	Male, ages 17 and up	40	52	130.0
Givens Youth Correction Center (GYCC)	3	Minimum	Male, ages 17 and up—primarily youthful offenders 17-25	76	121	159.2
Greenwood Correctional Center (GCC)	9	Minimum	Male, ages 17 and up—includes some inmates undergoing intake processing	48	90	187.5
Hillcrest Correctional Center (HCC)	2	Minimum	Male, ages 17 and up	60	110	183.3
Laurens Correctional Center (LCC)	8	Minimum	Male, ages 17 and up—includes some inmates undergoing intake processing	40	52	130.0
Northside Correctional Center (NCC)	6	Minimum	Male, ages 17 and up	30	47	156.7
Oaklawn Correctional Center (OCC)	4	Minimum	Male, ages 17 and up	60	112	186.7
Piedmont Work Release Center (PiWRC)	6	Minimum	Male, ages 17 and up—inmates on work release or accelerated pre-release programs	90	106	117.8
Travelers Rest Correctional Center (TRCC)	1	Minimum	Male, ages 17 and up	50	88	176.0
MIDLANDS CORRECTIONAL REGION						
Aiken Youth Correction Center (AYCC)	16	Minimum	Male, ages 17-21—primarily youthful offenders	238	195	81.9
Campbell Work Release Center (CWRC)	12	Minimum	Male, ages 17 and up—inmates on work release or accelerated pre-release programs	100	150	150.0
Catawba Work Release Center (CaWRC)	10	Minimum	Male, ages 17 and up—inmates on work release or accelerated pre-release programs	70	85	121.4
Central Correctional Institution (CCI)	14	Maximum/ Medium	Male, ages 17 and up	1,100	1,647	149.7

	Key to Location Map (Figure 2)	Degree of Security	Description of Resident Population	Design Capacity	Average Daily Population FY 1980	Avg. Daily Popul. as Percentage of Design Capacity
Employment Program Dorm (EPD)	12	Minimum	Male, ages 17 and up—participants in the Employment Program	50	65	130.0
Goodman Correctional Institution (GCI)	12	Minimum	Male, ages 17 and up—primarily geriatric and handicapped inmates	84	100	119.0
Kirkland Correctional Institution (KCI)	12	Maximum/ Medium	Male, ages 17 and up	448	1,096	244.6
Lexington Correctional Center (LCC)	15	Minimum	Male, ages 17 and up—inmate staff working in the Columbia area	40	86	215.0
Lower Savannah Work Release Center (LSWRC)	16	Minimum	Male, ages 17 and up—inmates on work release or accelerated pre-release programs	45	67	148.9
Manning Correctional Institution (MCI)	13	Medium	Male, ages 17 and up—primarily youthful offenders 17-25	300	449	149.7
Maximum Security Center (MSC)	14	Minimum	Male, ages 17 and up	80	94	117.5
Midlands Reception and Evaluation Center <sup>1</sup> (MR&EC)	14	Maximum	Male, ages 17 and up—inmates undergoing intake processing	180	173	96.1
Walden Correctional Institution (WCI)	12	Minimum	Male, ages 17 and up—primarily trustee grade inmates	150	166	110.7
Watkins Pre-Release Center (WPRC)	12	Minimum	Male, ages 17 and up—inmates on work release or accelerated pre-release programs	129	172	133.3
Women's Correctional Center (WCC)	12	Minimum	Female, ages 17 and up	168	256	152.4
Women's Work Release Dormitory (WWRD)	12	Minimum	Female, ages 17 and up—inmates on work release and employment programs	49	64	130.6
COASTAL CORRECTIONAL REGION						
Coastal Work Release Center (CoWRC)	22	Minimum	Male, ages 17 and up—inmates on work release or accelerated pre-release programs	62	98	158.1
MacDougall Youth Correction Center (MYCC)	20	Minimum	Male, ages 17 and up	240	421	175.4
Palmer Work Release Center (PWRC)	19	Minimum	Male, ages 17 and up—inmates on work release or accelerated pre-release programs	50	106	212.0
Wateree River Correctional Institution (WRCI)	17	Minimum	Male, ages 17 and up	240	475	197.9

<sup>1</sup> This center serves as a regional intake service center for both the Midlands and Coastal Regions. The design capacity and FY 1980 average population shown for the Midlands Reception and Evaluation Center include both the Reception and Evaluation Center proper (capacity 100) and the leased portion of the Columbia City Jail (capacity 80).

**FIGURE 2**

**LOCATIONS OF SCDL INSTITUTIONS AND CENTERS, AS OF JUNE 30, 1980**

**APPALACHIAN CORRECTIONAL REGION**


- 1 Travelers Rest Correctional Center
- 2 Appalachian R & E Center  
Blue Ridge PR/WR Center  
Hillcrest Correctional Center
- 3 Givens Youth Correction Center
- 4 Oaklawn Correctional Center
- 5 Duncan Correctional Center
- 6 Northside Correctional Center  
Piedmont WR Center  
Regional Corrections Coordinating Office
- 7 Cherokee Correctional Center
- 8 Laurens Correctional Center
- 9 Greenwood Correctional Center

**MIDLANDS CORRECTIONAL REGION**

- 10 Catawba WR Center
- 11 Lexington Correctional Center
- 12 Aiken Youth Correction Center  
Lower Savannah WR Center
- 13 Campbell WR Center  
Employment Program Dorm  
Goodman Correctional Institution  
Kirkland Correctional Institution  
Regional Corrections Coordinating Office  
Walden Correctional Institution  
Watkins PR Center  
Women's Correctional Center  
Women Work Release Dorm
- 14 Manning Correctional Institution
- 15 Central Correctional Institution  
Maximum Security Center  
Midlands R & E Center
- 16 Wateree River Correctional Institution

**COASTAL CORRECTIONAL REGION**

- 17 Palmer WR Center
- 18 MacDougall Youth Correction Center
- 19 Regional Corrections Coordinating Office
- 20 Coastal WR Center



## HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

Corrections in South Carolina has evolved, over the years, from county-operated prison systems to state administered institutions; from a single state penitentiary to a network of penal facilities throughout the State; from a punishment-oriented philosophy to a philosophy emphasizing humane treatment, rehabilitative services and community-based correctional programs. The following summary of significant developments and events in this evolution during the last several decades provides a perspective for the current efforts of the South Carolina Department of Corrections.<sup>5</sup>

### Dual Prison System and Creation of SCDC

As a humane alternative to cruelties which had prevailed under county supervision of convicts, in 1866 the General Assembly passed an act which transferred the control of convicted and sentenced felons from the counties to the State and established the State Penitentiary. Although the Act stripped the counties of their responsibility for handling felons, shortly thereafter the counties' demands for labor for building and maintaining roads prompted the reversal of this provision; and by 1930 county supervisors assumed full authority to choose to retain convicts for road construction or to transfer them to the State. This dual prison system of state administered facilities and local prison and jail operations resulted in inequitable treatment of prisoners, and criticism of the system was widespread.

In the midst of the political and legal developments concerning state and county jurisdiction over convicts, the State Penitentiary expanded to a network of penal facilities throughout the State and experienced changes reflecting the evolution of correctional philosophy from retribution and punishment to humane treatment and rehabilitation. Despite notable improvements, overcrowding and mismanagement prevailed; as a result, the state correctional system was reorganized, and the Department of Corrections was created through legislative action in 1960. But the autonomy of the state and local systems remained intact, and the dual prison system continued.

Problems inherent in the dual prison system became increasingly evident as crime soared in the 1960's. The most critical problems were related to the absence of adequate planning and programming, inefficiency of resource utilization and inequitable distribu-

---

<sup>5</sup> For greater details of these developments and events, see previous SCDC Annual Reports.



tion of rehabilitative services. Therefore, system reform of the total adult corrections system in South Carolina was necessary.

### **Consolidation of the South Carolina Adult Corrections System**

While the problems of the dual prison system and the need for system reform had long been recognized, the major impetus for reform of the South Carolina adult corrections system was the 1973 Adult Corrections Study conducted by the Office of Criminal Justice Programs (OCJP). The major recommendations of this study were the elimination of the dual system in favor of a consolidated state system and regionalization of SCDC operations. Under the proposed consolidated system, the State would be responsible for all long-term adult offenders, ensuring their humane treatment, providing confinement, programs and services close to their home communities. Under the proposed regionalization, the State would be divided into ten correctional regions, and a regional corrections coordinating office, headed by a regional administrator, would be established in each region. The regional corrections coordinating office would be responsible for administration of all SCDC facilities in the area, including the development, coordination and support of regional correctional programs in their respective regions, and for coordination with the Department's central headquarters. Such regionalization was designed to provide for improved planning, coordination and administration of SCDC operations and to facilitate effective and efficient utilization of local community resources.

While some recommendations in the Adult Corrections Study were modified in the course of implementation, the overall concept was adopted as policy by the State Board of Corrections, and steps were immediately taken to consolidate and regionalize the adult corrections system in South Carolina. The major step toward consolidation was the closure of county prison operations. Legislation passed in June, 1974, gave the State jurisdiction over all adult offenders with sentences exceeding three months, and counties were required to transfer any such prisoners in their facilities to the Department. Either voluntarily or through negotiations with SCDC officials, counties began transferring their long-term prisoners to the State and closing their prison operations in May, 1973. Since May 1, 1973, 27 counties have closed their prisons or converted them to other use. As of June 30, 1980, only 11 counties operate prisons as a separate facility. Other counties operate combined facilities for detainees and sentenced inmates, county jails, correctional centers, detention centers and/or law enforcement centers.

The assumption of county prisoners and closing of local prison systems enabled the Department to take steps toward the ultimate regionalization of SCDC operations. One of the major steps toward implementation of regionalization was the alignment of contiguous planning districts into correctional regions. Continual in-house study of the geographic distribution of offenders and cost-benefit analysis of resource utilization resulted in the Department's decision in FY 1975 to reduce the proposed number of correctional regions from the ten originally recommended by the Adult Correctional Study to four. Further in-depth examination of regionalization was undertaken as an integral part of the Ten Year Comprehensive Growth and Capital Improvements Plan developed in FY 1977 by the contract consultant, Stephen Carter and Associates. After studying the distribution of SCDC facilities throughout the State, the commitment trends of the inmate population, the Department's manpower and financial resources and the capital improvement requirements, the consultant recommended that the Department further reduce the number of correctional regions from four to three. This recommendation was implemented; and by the end of FY 1979, three correctional regions—Appalachian, Midlands, and Coastal—were established and became fully operational through regional corrections coordinating offices. As of June 30, 1980, all thirty-two of the Department's facilities were assigned under the administration of regional administrators through the regional corrections coordinating office in each of the correctional regions.

### **Population and Financial Crisis in Fiscal Years 1975 and 1976**

SCDC's efforts to regionalize were made more difficult by the fact that this occurred during a time of unprecedented increases in crime in South Carolina, as well as throughout the nation. As a result of increasing crime, the counties' transfer of inmates to the State, and the legislative mandate for all long-term prisoners to be under SCDC jurisdiction, the Department experienced an unprecedented influx of offenders through the state corrections system during FY 1975. The number of inmates under state jurisdiction on June 30, 1975, (5,658) was 53% higher than on the same date the previous year (3,693). There was also an increase of more than 30% in the *average* daily population from FY 1974 to FY 1975 (from 3,542 to 4,618), the largest known yearly increase in average daily population in SCDC history. However, this percentage increase was surpassed during FY 1976 when the average daily population under SCDC jurisdiction (6,264) increased by 35.6% over

the FY 1975 figure. Such increases in the number of inmates under the state jurisdiction have been among the severest in the nation, as indicated by a nationwide survey of the National Clearinghouse for Criminal Justice Planning and Architecture. The state offender commitment rate was also ranked third highest in the nation in 1975. Another survey showed that South Carolina experienced the nation's second highest percentage increase in state inmate population between January 1, 1975, and January 1, 1976. Between those two dates, SCDC population jumped by 38% as compared with an 11% increase in the total U. S. incarcerated population in state and federal prisons.

The dramatic increases in inmate population in Fiscal Years 1975 and 1976 have resulted in continued and intensified overcrowding in SCDC facilities as well as a constant strain on the Department's financial resources. Therefore, while efforts toward system consolidation and regionalization have continued, the Department has been forced to focus primary attention on solving the problems of overcrowding and limited financial resources. Short-term and long-range strategies directed toward overcoming either or both problems have involved renovation of existing facilities; realignment of existing space use; acquisition of additional facilities; expanded use of designated facilities; revision of Youthful Offender institutional release policies; revision of fiscal policies and procedures; introduction of economizing measures; revision of capital improvement plans; implementation of the Extended Work Release Program as an alternative to continued incarceration, and implementation of an Earned Work Credit Program, providing reduction in time to serve for inmates participating in productive work.

#### **Stabilized Inmate Population Growth Fiscal Years 1977-1979**

Partly as a result of SCDC's implementation of program alternatives to incarceration and partly because of a stabilization of commitments to the correctional system, the dramatic population increase in Fiscal Years 1975 and 1976 did not persist in subsequent years. Inmate population continued to increase but at a moderate rate, and in FY 1977-79 stabilization in the population level was witnessed. On June 30, 1977, incarcerated inmates under SCDC custody reached 7,632, which is 10.4% more than on the same date a year before. On June 30, 1978, the corresponding number was 7,597, 4.6% less than that a year before. On June 30, 1979, the incarcerated population under SCDC jurisdiction totalled 7,772, 2.3% higher than that a year prior. Average daily incarcerated in-



mate population was 7,167 in FY 1977, 7,447 in FY 1978 and 7,623 in FY 1979. Whereas FY 1977's level was a 14.4% increase over FY 1976, the daily average in FY 1979 represents a moderate 6.4% increase over that in FY 1977 in a span of two years.

### **SIGNIFICANT DEVELOPMENTS IN FY 1980**

Facilities and programs administered and operated by SCDC during FY 1980 are described in pages 18 through 20 and in Appendix C respectively. Summarized in this section are major activities/events or new programs initiated or projects completed during the year that are considered accomplishments or which would impact on the system significantly in future years. Deficiencies or trends which would affect future policy directions are also addressed.

FY 1980 continued to be a year of fiscal restraint and moderate inmate growth, with a SCDC facility overcrowding level sustained at 52% exceeding total design capacity. During this period, beyond day-to-day operations of facilities and programs, efforts concentrated on improving the efficiency and effectiveness in inmate management and service delivery; implementing the Ten Year Capital Improvements Plan; preparations for the FY 1981 opening of two major new facilities; expanding prison industry markets and products lines; initiating and implementing fiscal control measures to contain costs and cope with inflation; expanding the capabilities of automated information and resource management systems; reducing personnel turnover; and coordinating with other criminal justice agencies in the development of long-range strategies to reduce prison overcrowding through alternatives to incarceration. Two SCDC programs also received citation at the national and international levels.

### **Inmate Population Flows and Characteristics**

Detailed inmate statistics are presented in the Statistical Section, pages 62 to 135. Pages 70 to 87 therein delineate the characteristics of inmates admitted to SCDC during FY 1980. Pages 88 to 113 describe the inmate population in SCDC at the end of FY 1980. Pages 114 to 118 pertain to inmates released from SCDC during FY 1980. The following provides an overview of inmate population flow and characteristics.

### *Average Population and Facility Occupancy in FY 1980.*

- During FY 1980, on an average daily basis, SCDC had 7,869 incarcerated inmates under its custody. For every 100 inmates, 91 were housed in SCDC facilities and 9 in Designated Facilities.
- SCDC's average daily population in FY 1980 was a moderate increase of 3.2% from that of FY 1979.
- SCDC facilities continued to be overcrowded in FY 1980, since no major construction was completed during the year to provide relief in bed spaces available. Overall, SCDC facilities were housing about one and one-half times the number of inmates they were designed to hold.
- Individually, Kirkland Correctional Institution was the most overcrowded, housing two and one-quarter times as many as its design capacity. Three other facilities holding close to twice their respective design capacities were: Lexington Correctional Center, Palmer Work Release Center, and Wateree River Correctional Institution.
- In only two of the 32 SCDC facilities was there a lack of overcrowding on an average daily basis.
- Of the 32 SCDC facilities, 26 were housing more inmates on an average daily basis in FY 1980 than in FY 1979.

### *Profile of Inmates Admitted to SCDC During FY 1980.*

Of the 5,049 admissions recorded by the Correctional Information System during FY 1980, their profile was as follows:

- For every 100 inmates admitted, 46 were white male, 48 non-white male, three white female and three non-white female.
- Forty-two (42) out of every 100 inmates admitted were from the Appalachian Region, 32 from the Midlands Correctional Region and 26 from the Coastal Region.
- The leading (most common) offenses among admissions were: Larceny (25 out of 100 inmates admitted were convicted of this offense), Dangerous Drugs (9/100), traffic offenses<sup>6</sup> (8/100), Burglary (8/100), Robbery (7/100), and Assault (6/100). (This pattern is similar to that for admissions in FY 1979).
- The average age for inmates admitted in FY 1980 was 27 years (one year younger than FY 1979 admissions). Generally

---

<sup>6</sup> Including Driving Under the Influence.

as groups, non-whites were slightly younger (one to two years) than whites, and males slightly younger than females.

- For every 100 inmates admitted, 20 were 19 years of age or younger and 51 between 20 to 29 years of age (more than half, therefore, were 30 or younger).
- On an average, inmates admitted in FY 1980 had an average sentence of four years and seven months. (This average is five months higher than that in FY 1979.)
- Generally, non-white male admissions had longer average sentences than white males (five years for the former, four years and four months for the latter). Noted differences in offenses/nature of crimes may contribute to variations in sentence. Female admissions had shorter average sentences than males.
- For every 100 admissions, 19 had a YOA sentence and 31 had a sentence of a year or less. Both the number and proportion of YOA's decreased in FY 1980 as compared to FY 1979 (71 less). The reverse was true of the one year or less category (115 more in FY 1980).

*Profile of Inmates in SCDC as of June 28, 1979.*

There was a total of 8,087 inmates in SCDC as of June 28, 1980 (396 or 5.1% more than about the same date a year ago). The characteristics of these inmates were as follows:

- For every 100 inmates in SCDC, 41 of them were white males, 55 non-white males, 2 white females and 2 non-white females.
- There were about the same proportion of non-white males in the system on June 28, 1980 (55%), as there were on June 30, 1979 (55%). The same was true of white males (41%).
- Out of every 100 inmates, 14 were in AA custody, 40 in A, 36 in B, 8 in C, and 1 in M. This custody grade composition had no major difference from that on June 30, 1979. Although there were slightly more inmates in B custody and slightly less in C custody on June 28, 1980, the combined B and C category of medium security inmates constituted around 44% of the population on both June 28, 1979 and June 28, 1980.
- Leading offenses for inmates in SCDC on June 28, 1980, were: Larceny (42 out of every 100 inmates were convicted of this offense), Robbery (26/100), Homicide (17/100), Burglary (17/100), Assault (14/100) and Dangerous Drugs (12/100).

(This configuration was about the same as that of the population on June 30, 1979.)<sup>7</sup>

- The average age among all inmates in SCDC on June 28, 1980, was 29 years of age (29 years a year ago). This average was the same for females. Non-white males were about the same age as their white counterparts (28 years).
- The average sentence of the SCDC inmate population on this date was 11 years 11 months. For the non-white males, the average was 12 years 10 months, as compared to 11 years for white males and eight years and eight months for both white and non-white female inmates.
- There were more YOA's in SCDC on June 28, 1980 than a year ago (859 or 10.6% versus 820 or 10.7%). There was also an increase in the number of lifers [610 (7.5%) on June 30, 1980, versus 552 (7.2%) a year ago].
- On June 28, 1980, there were relatively more non-white males (7.8%) than white males (7.1%) in the life sentence category, whereas, there were more white males (13.4%) than non-white males (8.3%) in the YOA sentence category.

#### *Statistics on Inmates Released from SCDC During FY 1980.*

During FY 1980, SCDC released 4,686 inmates. Out of every 100 inmates released, 19 were youthful offenders paroled by the Youthful Offender Branch of SCDC's Division of Classification and Community Programs; 29 were paroled by the Probation, Parole and Pardon Board; 36 had served the maximum term of their sentence after consideration for good time credits; and 11 were placed on probation. The remaining 5 were released upon paying a fine or appeal bond or death.

- For every 100 inmates released, over half (52) served one year or less while close to two served ten or more years. The average time served for all inmates released was one year and nine months.
- Of these inmates eligible and considered for parole at parole hearings in FY 1980, 1,344 (61%) were granted parole.

---

<sup>7</sup> Because of the relatively fast turnover with short sentences, the leading offenses for the inmate population in SCDC on specific dates were quite different from those for admission cohorts. Traffic offenses which carry relatively short sentences were the second leading (most common) among admissions cohorts, but ranked number eight among offenses for the inmate population as of June 28, 1980. Only 7.8% of inmate population as of that date were convicted of traffic offenses whereas 17.0% of FY 1980 admissions were serving time for the same crimes.



### **Complete Regionalization of SCDC Facilities**

During FY 1980, complete regionalization of SCDC correctional facilities was achieved. At the end of FY 1979, four SCDC facilities (KCI, CCI, MSC and WRCI) were non-regionalized, that is, not under the management control of a regional administrator. By January, 1980, CCI, MSC, and KCI had been placed under the Midlands Correctional Region and the WRCI under the Coastal Correctional Region. Accordingly, all SCDC facilities were operated under the management responsibilities of three regional correctional administrators. Under the Appalachian Correctional Region are 12 facilities with a total design capacity of 783 and a maximum operational capacity of 986. During FY 1980, an average daily total of 1,170 inmates were serving time in the facilities therein. Sixteen facilities were in the Midlands Correctional Region. On an average daily basis during FY 1980, 4,865 inmates were housed in facilities of this region which had a total design capacity of 3,231 and a total maximum operating capacity of 3,622. The Coastal Correctional Region was comprised of 4 facilities with a total design capacity of 592 and a maximum operating capacity of 779. An average daily population of 1,100 inmates were assigned to the Coastal Correctional Region during FY 1980.

### **Ten Year Capital Improvements Plan**

During FY 1980, the average daily inmate population under SCDC jurisdiction was 7,869. Of these, 7,003 were housed in SCDC facilities resulting in an average daily occupancy or overcrowding rate of 52% above their total design capacity of 4,606. Relief to overcrowding was to be provided through new facilities to be constructed under SCDC's Ten Year Capital Improvements Plan approved by the Budget and Control Board in 1977.

In 1973 and 1974, the SCDC submitted capital improvements proposals to the State Budget and Control Board and in 1975 developed a master plan for the future growth of the Department through 1982. As the inmate population increased dramatically in 1975 and since continual increase was anticipated, it became apparent that the Department's capital improvements needs had to be reevaluated. In May, 1976, the consulting firm of Stephen Carter and Associates was retained to complete a ten-year improvements plan for the Department. The resultant document, *Comprehensive Growth and Capital Improvements Plan*, addressed future population projections, facility construction requirements, cost reducing alternatives to inmate population growth, and future

directions for regionalization. The number of inmates in SCDC facilities was forecast to be 8,040 in 1980 and 12,500 by 1986. To accommodate this population level, the consultant recommended a three-phase capital improvements plan which included the construction of 8,064 new bedspaces to replace some existing facilities and to meet additional needs. The total cost was estimated to be \$116 million at the 1976 price level.

The Ten Year Capital Improvements Plan was endorsed by the Budget and Control Board and over a three-year period, a total of \$66,528,978 (\$19,720,760 in 1977; \$16,033,936 in 1978; and \$30,774,282 in 1979) were approved for SCDC implementation of Phase I, Phase II and Phase III projects as proposed in the plan. During FY 1980, various construction activities were ongoing with regard to these projects. The completion of projects in these three phases would yield 2,928 new bedspaces. Details on the funds allocated for and status of these projects at the end of FY 1980 are presented as follows:

## STATUS OF APPROVED CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROJECTS

### PHASE I

Projects	Status as of June 30, 1980	Estimated Completion Date	Approved Funds
Prototypical Design	A/E Services Continues		\$ 1,146,500
Perry—576 Bed Medium/ Maximum Security	68% Complete	3-31-81	14,069,409
Dutchman—528 Bed Minimum Security	80% Complete	9-30-80	9,161,858
896 Bed Minimum Security (Addition to WRCI)	70% Complete	11-30-80	622,837
8Abattoir	Completed	Not Applicable	435,000
8Renovations—KCI	Completed	Not Applicable	150,000
8Renovations—WRCI	70% Complete	12-31-80	377,000
8Roof Repair—MYCC	Completed	Not Applicable	40,000
8Renovations—SPHC	Completed	Not Applicable	180,000
TOTALS PHASE I (1,200 Beds)			\$26,182,685

<sup>8</sup> Inmate Construction Projects.

# STATUS OF APPROVED CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROJECTS

## PHASE II

Projects	Status as of June 30, 1980	Estimated Completion Date	Approved Funds
528 Bed Minimum Security— Cross Anchor	Design Completed	11-30-82	\$10,609,538
<sup>9</sup> 144 Bed Pre-Release— NCC Addition	65% Complete	10-31-80	1,488,991
<sup>9</sup> 96 Bed Work Release— Livesay Work Release Center	20% Complete	3-31-81	980,748
<sup>9</sup> 96 Bed Minimum Security (Addition to WRCI)	70% Complete	11-30-80	622,929
96 Bed Work Release— Coastal Region	Land Purchased	1-31-82	1,157,118
<sup>9</sup> Outpatient Clinic— Perry	Design Underway	6-30-82	970,544
<sup>9</sup> Renovations	7% Complete	6-30-82	1,490,000
Civilian Personnel			854,000
Construction Equipment			273,936
TOTALS PHASE II (960 Beds)			\$18,407,804

<sup>9</sup> Inmate Construction Projects.



## STATUS OF APPROVED CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROJECTS

### PHASE III

Projects	Status as of June 30, 1980	Estimated Completion Date	Approved Funds
<sup>10</sup> 528 Bed Medium/ Maximum Security— Coastal Region	Pre-construction Activities Ongoing	5-31-83	\$17,452,420
<sup>11</sup> 96 Bed Medium Security (Addition to WCC)	Pre-construction Activities Ongoing	8-31-82	810,289
<sup>11</sup> 144 Bed Pre-Release— Midlands Region	Pre-construction Activities Ongoing	8-31-82	1,722,825
<sup>12</sup> Dairy—WRCI	Pre-construction Activities Ongoing	8-31-82	800,000
Warehouse, Food Service— SCDC Headquarters	Pre-construction Activities Ongoing	12-31-81	223,277
Warehouse, Industries— SCDC Headquarters	Pre-construction Activities Ongoing	5-31-82	448,450
<sup>11</sup> Warehouse, Regional— Appalachian Region	Pre-construction Activities Ongoing	Under Study	196,603
<sup>11</sup> Regional Office— Appalachian Region	Pre-construction Activities Ongoing	10-31-81	223,077
Bond Service Cost			61,548
TOTAL PHASE III (768 Beds)			\$21,938,489

While the Division of Construction monitored the progress of construction projects and implemented the plan's three phases as approved by the Budget and Control Board, SCDC's planning and analysis staff monitored population trends and bedspace demand on an ongoing basis. Based on the experienced and projected impact of the Extended Work Release Program and the Earned Work Credit Program as authorized by the Litter Control Act <sup>13</sup>, the previous population projection utilized by Stephen Carter and Associates in the 1976 Ten Year Capital Improvements Plan was revised. The updated forecast utilized the state's general population and unemployment forecast as the basis of its estimates and assumes no change in legislation, adjudication pattern of courts, or parole decisions which would result in acceleration or decelera-

<sup>10</sup> Combined Contract and Inmate Construction.

<sup>11</sup> Inmate Construction Projects.

<sup>12</sup> Funds available through transfer from Industries Warehouse project; inmate construction.

<sup>13</sup> Descriptions of these two programs are contained in pages 35-38, respectively.

tion of inmate admissions or affect the sentencing, admission, parole or release of inmates. Based on the forecast, the total average SCDC inmate population was projected to increase on only 9,864 for FY 1989, a considerable reduction from the number previously used. The result would be a substantial decrease in construction requirements and additional operating costs during the ten-year period. Based on these revisions which reflect the impact of earned work credits and a projected stabilization of commitment trends, SCDC estimated its bedspace requirement in FY 1989 would be 9,064 (600 out of the projected 9,864 inmates would be placed in designated facilities and 200 on extended work release in the community.) Since Phase I, II and III projects would not yield adequate bedspace supply to meet this demand, additional projects to yield 2,688 new bedspaces were proposed. Of the total 2,688 new bedspaces, 1,872 were planned to be constructed through the inmate construction program and 816 by contract. The total costs of these proposed projects at 1979 dollar levels was \$70,084,729. The proposed new projects were described in an update of the Ten Year Capital Improvements Program completed in December, 1979. This document was submitted to the Budget and Control Board for its review and comment.

### **Renovations of SCDC Facilities**

Since many of SCDC's existing facilities were antiquated structures, considerable renovations were required throughout the year. The most notable renovation project completed by the Department's Division of Engineering and Maintenance during the year was the Death House at CCI. Structural improvements included the upgrade of the interior living area along with electrical switch gear and apparatus, installation of new plumbing and electrical systems.

Whereas some facility renovations such as those at KCI, WRCI, MYCC, and SPHC were completed as inmate labor projects in the Ten Year Capital Improvements Plan, the Division of Engineering and Maintenance also performed other major repairs in order to maintain SCDC facilities in operational conditions. Among these projects were the upgrading of the Quonset type dormitories and the addition of lockup and control buildings at AYCC. Other renovations were made at CCI, MSC and MR&E.

Besides ongoing renovations, SCDC's maintenance staff also developed plans for a comprehensive preventive maintenance program which would include upgrading the fire warning alarm and

extinguishing systems and energy conservation repairs which would reduce utility consumption and expenses. If funding should be available for such a preventive maintenance program, it is hoped that efficiency in physical plant management would be enhanced.

### **Preparations for Administering the Death Penalty**

By statute (Section 24-3-540 of the South Carolina Code of Laws), SCDC has the responsibility of "providing a death chamber and all necessary appliances for inflicting such penalty by electrocution and pay the costs thereof out of any funds in its hand. The expense of transporting any such criminals to the State Penitentiary shall be borne by the county in which the offense was committed." By Section 24-3-520, SCDC was to receive persons sentenced to capital punishment "not more than 20 days nor less than two days prior to the time fixed in the judgment for the execution of such condemned person, unless otherwise directed by the Governor or unless a stay of execution has been caused by appeal or the granting of a new trial or other order of a court of competent jurisdiction."

SCDC has been housing death row inmates as safekeepers for the counties since the passage and amendment on June 28, 1977, of the current death penalty law.<sup>14</sup> SCDC had received 12 inmates who were maintained on SCDC's death row as of June 30, 1980. Among the 12 inmates who were in various stages of appealing their sentences, eight were white and four were non-white. All were males and convicted of murder. The average age was 27 and they had spent an average of 20 months in CCI.

In November, 1979, as the execution date of one death row inmate was imminent, SCDC had to renovate extensively the death house where the last execution occurred in 1962. A new heating and air conditioning system and an emergency electric generator were installed, plumbing was renovated, and the interior structure was refinished to repair a deteriorating roof. Total renovation of the death house cost \$37,463 in FY 1980.

Besides renovations, SCDC staff also finalized a set of execution policy and procedures to ensure that in the event of an electrocution, proper and standardized procedures would be observed. However, no electrocution was carried out during the year since the inmate concerned was granted a stay of execution by a federal judge.

---

<sup>14</sup> The law allows for a bifurcated trial and sentence hearing, whereby, upon conviction for murder the court conducts a separate sentencing proceeding to decide between the death sentence and life imprisonment.



## **Budget Deficit in FY 1980**

Since SCDC's base budget allocation for FY 1980 contained no increases over previous years to allow for inmate population growth and inflationary factors, a budget deficit was anticipated at the beginning of the fiscal year. SCDC monitored and analyzed its financial and budgetary data on an ongoing basis and in November, 1979, a deficit of approximately \$1 million was projected based on expenditure patterns during the first four months of the fiscal year. Accordingly, a Supplemental Appropriations request was submitted to the Budget and Control Board to solicit additional funds to pay for extra expenses in food, supplies, physician and hospitalization fees, utilities, and other items which had increased as a result of a moderate gain in inmate population, inflation and inadequate appropriations.

As the Budget and Control Board was considering the Supplemental Appropriations request, SCDC also implemented cost-saving/reduction measures in an attempt to absorb part of the deficit. Among such measures were: a hiring freeze on all non-security vacancies; postponement in the hiring of staff for new facilities; reduction in the purchase of supplies, repairs, and in vehicle mileage; and acquisition of surplus USDA food items.

Towards the end of FY 1980, as a result of the aforementioned measures, SCDC was able to reduce its projected deficit. The Budget and Control Board approved a \$250,000 Supplemental Appropriation in June, 1980; SCDC's year-end deficit in operating expenses in FY 1980 totalled approximately \$525,000. Subsequently, approval was requested from the Budget and Control Board to carry forward the deficit to FY 1981. Simultaneously, a preliminary analysis was conducted of SCDC's FY 1981 budget allocation exclusive of the anticipated \$525,000 deficit. As the deficit in operating expenses was expected to recur in FY 1981, SCDC continued the program of austerity and centralized control of purchasing in order to reduce expenditures in the upcoming year.

## **Earned Work Credit Program (EWCP)**

SCDC's budget deficit would have been worse had there not been the Earned Work Credit Program and the Extended Work Release Program which reduced the number of inmates having to be housed, fed and supervised in SCDC facilities.

Whereas the stabilization of the inmate population was partially explained by a levelling commitment trend, SCDC's Earned Work Credit Program, effective July 3, 1979, was also a key factor in

decreasing the number of incarcerated inmates in SCDC, thereby reducing the pressure on bedspace requirements.

The Earned Work Credit Program was authorized as part of the Litter Control Act signed into law by the Governor on May 5, 1978. In addition to providing for the use of inmates for litter control and removal, the Act amended Section 24-13-230 of the 1976 S. C. Code of Laws, and authorized SCDC's Commissioner to allow a reduction of the term of sentence of inmates assigned productive duty. Earned Work Credits were to be awarded on the basis of performance on the assigned job as well as the classification level. The job levels and the credits for a full-time job requiring more than four hours a day are as follows:

Level 2: One Earned Work Credit for each two days worked:

Level 3: One Earned Work Credit for each three days worked.

Level 5: One Earned Work Credit for each five days worked.

Level 7: One Earned Work Credit for each seven days worked.

Those assigned to part-time jobs, requiring up to four hours work each work day, can earn one-half of the amount of credits shown above.

During FY 1980, an average of 5,345 inmates (or 68% of the SCDC average daily population) were engaged productively on jobs and earning credits toward their time to serve. An additional 737 inmates, on the average worked on jobs but due to their sentence category were not eligible for motivational work credits as specified by the Litter Control Act. Among those eligible for motivational work credit, a total of 390,959 motivational work credits were earned during this period for a productivity average of 73 credit days per inmate. These credits ultimately will result in an early release date for each of these inmates at an average of 57 days per 100 credit days earned for those released with sentence served and 100 days per 100 credit days for those paroled. A detailed breakdown of the daily average number of inmates in each job assignment, and the total and average numbers of work credits generated by each job during this period is presented in Table 27 in the Statistical Section, pages 119 through 127. The profile of inmates at each job level of productive work close to the end of FY 1980 was as follows:



Level	Full Time	Part-time	Number of Inmates
2 (One day credit for each two days worked)	1,423 <sup>15</sup>	0	1,423
3 (One day credit for each three days worked)	1,411	37	1,448
5 (One day credit for each five days worked)	1,109	7	1,116
7 (One day credit for each seven days worked)	1,146	207	1,353
Unassigned <sup>16</sup>	2,747	—	2,747
TOTAL	7,836	251	8,087

The Earned Work Credit Program was conceived as a strategy to stabilize inmate population, thereby controlling the spiralling long-term capital improvements and operating costs. Although the program has been authorized for only two years and was fully operational for about 1½ years through the end of FY 1980, the effects of earned work credits had already impacted on the SCDC population level and operational costs through the reduction in time served of released inmates. Between July 1, 1979, and June 30, 1980, 4,686 inmates were released from SCDC. Out of that number 2,772 inmates (59%) had their time served reduced via the productive work provisions of the Litter Control Act.<sup>17</sup> Collectively, these 2,772 released inmates had their time reduced by 185,705 inmate days (or an average of 67 days per inmate affected). Thus, due to Earned Work Credit provisions, the average decrease in bedspace needs was 509. The population count on June 30, 1980, would have been 559 higher without the provisions of the Litter Control Act authorizing earned work credits. Using the FY 1980 average daily cost per inmate of \$13.65 of state funds (or \$15.47 of total funds) the reduction of time served of the 2,772

<sup>15</sup> Out of this, 53 jobs are assigned to the Litter Control Program at Horry, Richland and York Counties.

<sup>16</sup> Unassigned inmates are primarily those housed in the MR&E, AR&E, the MSC, and facilities for Youthful Offenders. These individuals were either undergoing the intake process, or were confined under maximum security, or were participating in education/rehabilitation program on a full-time basis.

<sup>17</sup> Of the remaining 1,914 inmates released, 331 had earned work credits totalling 6,997 but because of a combination of circumstances were not affected in their release eligibility.

released inmates generated a savings (or reduced the need) of \$2,534,873 in state funds (or \$2,872,856 in total funds).

The total impact of the Earned Work Credit Program since its inception on May 5, 1978, has been tremendous. Since the program became operational on July 3, 1978, 9,334 inmates have been released from SCDC. Of this number 4,704 inmates (50.4%) had their time served reduced as a result of this program. These 4,704 released inmates had their time reduced by 251,737 inmate days (or an average of 53.5 days per inmate affected). Using the average daily cost per inmate, for the period FY 79-80, of \$13.40 of state funds (or \$15.25 of total funds) the reduction of time served of the 4,704 released inmates generated a savings (or reduced the need) of \$3,373,276 in state funds (or \$3,838,989 in total funds).

Whereas these statistics were encouraging evidence of the population stabilization and cost saving effects of the Earned Work Credit Program, its potential and full impacts have yet to be seen. As the program continues and the time period in which inmates have accrued work credits lengthens, the program's results and impacts are expected to accumulate at an accelerating rate.

### **Extended Work Release Program**

The Extended Work Release Program, authorized by the Legislature on June 13, 1977, continued to provide relief to SCDC facility overcrowding by placing eligible inmates in the community under intensive supervision by both family sponsors and program staff. The program allows the exceptional work release inmates, convicted of a first and not more than a second offense for non-violent crime, to live with a community sponsor and be gainfully employed, thereby removing them from correctional facilities. Program participants are required to pay SCDC \$21 a week for supervision costs.

During FY 1980, 340 inmates were placed on the Extended Work Release Program, and 300 completed the program, being released or paroled from SCDC. The number of inmates in the program averaged 132 daily during the fiscal year. Besides reducing SCDC's bedspace demand by 132 on an average daily basis, the program participants also paid SCDC \$116,904 for supervision fees in FY 1980. In addition, \$25,937 in state taxes, \$88,772 in federal taxes, and \$51,635 in FICA payments were contributed by the inmates.

## **Victim Restitution Project**

During FY 1980, SCDC also explored restitution as another alternative to incarceration to reduce overcrowding. In November 1979, the SCDC received from the National Institute of Corrections a \$24,831 grant to conduct a restitution program planning project. Project activities included: review of literature and legislation on applicable restitution programs, development of information relative to restitution in South Carolina, drafting of appropriate legislation, development of program policies and procedures, and designing evaluation procedures to monitor the program implementation and results.

By June 30, 1980, the plan for implementing a restitution program in SCDC and all phases of grant activities were near completion. Legislation was passed and program operating guidelines were developed to enable the first but not more than second non-violent offenders, upon additional screening, to be eligible for the employment, work release, or extended work release programs earlier than is currently permitted if he/she pays restitution to the victims or contributes to the costs of administering the program. The program plan called for an additional screening personnel at both the Appalachian and Midlands Reception and Evaluation Centers so that eligible inmates can be identified upon entry into SCDC. The program would be administered and monitored by the Division of Classification and Community Services. It was projected that in early FY 1981, eligible inmates would be placed on the restitution program and victims of crimes would receive compensation.

## **Long-Range Planning for Alternatives to Incarceration**

The Earned Work Credit, the Extended Work Release and the Restitution Programs are alternatives to incarceration/continued incarceration which resulted/would result in the reduction of overcrowding/bedspace demand. These programs had become mandatory and essential as inflation, rising operating and construction costs, and continually increasing (even though moderately) commitments resulted in severe economic burdens on the state prison system. Whereas some of the alternatives to incarceration are within the statutory authority of SCDC, there are others requiring more extensive inter-agency cooperation.

Recognizing the economics of incarceration and its implications on the future financial obligations of state government, and realizing that the factors affecting prison admissions and population



levels are beyond SCDC control, SCDC's staff worked closely with the Office of Criminal Justice Programs in the Governor's Office and other criminal justice agencies to develop strategies to reduce the prison population. During FY 1980, key SCDC managers participated in several inter-agency planning sessions and SCDC's analysis staff conducted research and projections to estimate the impact of various program alternatives. Based on such analyses, SCDC drew the conclusion that if the SCDC inmate population was to be held at the level of bedspace capacity, allowed by the Ten Year Capital Improvements Plan, then admission levels or the time to serve of those admitted would have to decrease individually or simultaneously. To affect time to serve, changes can be made to the sentence distribution/structure of future admissions, their parole eligibility requirements, and their work credit distributions. To decrease bedspace demand in the long run therefore requires a concerted effort of the criminal justice system and policy planning which would result in the decrease in the level of future admission and/or modification of the sentence structure of these admissions, and/or other "release" strategies to result in a "faster" turnaround of the prison population, especially the long-termers, i.e., offenders with long sentences. Whereas concrete programs were not initiated during the fiscal year from these inter-agency efforts, the communication and coordination mechanisms were established wherefrom strategies can be implemented in the future.

### **Simplified Computation of Inmate Good Time Credits**

On June 12, 1980, a new Good Time law was signed by Governor Riley which combines into one statute the Statutory and Meritorious Good Time Laws. This development resulted from SCDC's proposal to the legislature to revise and combine into one the provisions of Sections 24-13-231 and 24-13-240 of the South Carolina Code of Laws. By consolidating good time provisions, the calculation of good time credits and their effect on time to serve were simplified, thereby facilitating a better understanding by inmates and staff.

Previously, Section 24-13-231 of the South Carolina Code of Laws provided inmates with "statutory" good time credit for good behavior. Generally, this law allowed an inmate to earn 15 days credit for each month he/she was incarcerated with good behavior from the point of sentence start date. Partial awards of the 15 days credit for a 30-day period could not be awarded at any time. Simultaneously, Section 24-13-240 provided additional credit for

"meritorious" conduct. Inmates serving a sentence of one year or more could acquire an additional 30 days of credit for each six-month period served in confinement when his conduct during that period was determined by the Department to be meritorious. Credits earned under this section were awarded in blocks of 30 days only and no partial award of less than 30 days were allowed.

The statute passed on June 12, 1980, essentially abolished the distinction between meritorious and statutory good time and simplified the calculation of credits for good behavior. For inmates with total sentences of less than one year, they will still receive good time credit at the rate of 15 days for each month served. For inmates with sentences of one year or more, they will be earning 20 days per month of good time credit for every month served. Accordingly, instead of maintaining and calculating two sets of credits, one computation and record will be sufficient for both the award and removal of good time credits. This statutory change would not result in any extension of time to serve but have made possible the month-by-month accumulation of what previously was known as meritorious good time. To ensure that inmates understand the purpose and practical implications of this new statute, all inmates were notified and SCDC classification and institutional management personnel provided clarifications on an individual basis as needed. The simplified computation of inmate good time credits was expected to increase the efficiency in inmate management and record maintenance functions.

### **Inmate Classification**

To standardize inmate management and assignment practices, SCDC updated and formalized its inmate classification policy and procedures in FY 1980. The policy provides for an assessment of inmates' needs and skills and the development of a classification plan for each inmate. Individual classification plans, based on the inmate's strengths, risks, and needs, as well as SCDC's resource availability, provide inmates at the Reception and Evaluation Centers with initial custody grade, facility, work and program assignments. The plans require ongoing monitoring by institutional classification teams who observe the individual inmate's behavior adjustment and performance in programs and work assignments and make decisions on alternative assignments as necessary. Standardized classification practices aimed at ensuring equity in inmate management, particularly in the areas of custody grade, facility, and work assignment, and program placements.



Incorporated in the new classification procedures was a master list of all felonies and misdemeanors and a categorization of offenses into violent and non-violent crimes. A suffix was added to the custody grade to indicate which category of crime the inmate had committed. This was to facilitate reception and evaluation personnel, classification teams, and program placement personnel in identifying and processing inmates since the nature of the crime committed very often was crucial in determining program participation eligibility.

The distinction of violent and non-violent crimes/inmates was also applied in the development of a comprehensive inmate classification plan at CCI. This plan was to meet the requirements of the Consent Order which settled the class action suit, *Mattison v. South Carolina Board of Corrections*<sup>18</sup>. Among the mandates therein was the development of a classification plan at CCI separating the violent inmates from the non-violent inmates.

New inmate management activities initiated during FY 1980 also included orientation sessions at both Reception and Evaluation Centers and other SCDC facilities. These sessions were to familiarize the newly arrived inmates with the environments and policies/procedures of the facility at which he/she will spend a certain period of time. It was hoped that this would facilitate inmate adjustment and encourage behavior conformance.

### **Recognition of the Youthful Offender Parole Program**

SCDC's youthful offender program consists of three components: pre-sentence investigation services for offenders considered for indeterminate sentencing by the judiciary; institutional services for offenders sentenced to an indeterminate term under the Youthful Offender Act; and parole supervision of youthful offenders released from SCDC. During FY 1980, the parole services component of SCDC's Youthful Offender Program was cited as an outstanding program in an LEAA study.

The Office of Development Testing and Dissemination of LEAA had conducted surveys and site studies of probation and parole programs throughout the nation in order to identify those programs and practices which appear to have special promise. As a result of such investigations, the SCDC's Youthful Offender Parole Program was selected along with 12 others as a program model and an example of promising strategy. The program was described in

---

<sup>18</sup> Details on this class action suit are described in SCDC's FY 1978 Annual Report, pages 20-21 and FY 1979 Annual Report, page 29.

an LEAA publication *Program Models, Promising Strategies in Probation and Parole*.

Another noteworthy development in the youthful offender program was the proposal that youthful offender parolees be required to pay a portion of parole supervision fees as a condition of parole. This proposal, if implemented, would provide some financial relief to SCDC and simultaneously induce greater responsibility on the part of parolees. At the end of FY 1980, legislation had been introduced at the General Assembly to provide SCDC with the statutory authority to impose such supervision fee.

### **Health Services Delivery**

To provide inmates with humane treatment as required by statute and to meet standards formulated from correctional case law, SCDC has to deliver to the inmate population health care services comparable to that available in the community. During FY 1980, SCDC health service delivery evidenced significant improvement, especially in the continual general upgrading of medical personnel. As a contrast to only one full-time physician for the entire inmate population in the early 1970's, in FY 1980, three full-time physicians were on the SCDC payroll. The division also attempted to fully utilize para-professionals, such as nurse practitioners in the health care delivery system. Whereas medical staff in the early 1970's was composed of a majority of non-licensed personnel, in FY 1980, 60% of the nursing staff was licensed. A goal was established to reach a totally licensed staff by FY 1983.

In November, 1979, a new 20-bed infirmary, licensed by the South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control, was opened at KCI and made available to patients in need of general nursing care. Patients who must be placed in hospitals are sent to either the State Park Health Center or community hospitals.

A Patient's Bill of Rights was affirmed during the fiscal year by the SCDC Inmate Advisory Council and the Division of Health Services. This is a written statement that outlines the responsibilities that medical personnel have to patients and the responsibilities that patients have for their own health. The purpose of the Patient's Bill of Rights was to build a better team approach to health care delivery for all inmate patients.

In another effort to bring the medical resources of the community closer to the SCDC population, the Correctional Health Care Advisory Committee was established. This committee reviews, evaluates, and recommends present and future correctional health

care programs, policies and issues to assist SCDC in exploring ways to improve health care for the inmate population. Committee members included faculty members of the University of South Carolina School of Medicine, various professionals at local hospitals and the chairman of the Inmate Advisory Council.

Although direct health care has risen from \$1,300,000 in 1976 to an estimated \$3,500,000 by the end of FY 1980, this represents a considerable increase in the quality of health care services provided to an expanded inmate population. Based on the average inmate population of 7,869 under SCDC jurisdiction in FY 1980, the per capita per inmate health care cost was \$303. This is compared to a per capita cost of \$275 for health care in FY 1979 without adjusting for inflation and increasing costs in medical supplies and equipment in the last few years.

### **Human Service Programs**

Following departmental reorganization in June, 1979, the Division of Human Services was created with a central office consisting of the Educational Services and Specialized Institutional Services Branches along with a Coordinator for Contracts, Grants and Agreements. The central office focuses toward technical program supervision, consultation, budgeting, institutional human services program audits, developing funds for special needs, contracts and grants development and coordination, and staff development and training responsibilities.

Besides internal coordination of programs, actions were initiated to facilitate coordination with other state or private community-based organizations. Service contracts or agreements were operationalized with the South Carolina Department of Vocational Rehabilitation, South Carolina Arts Commission, South Carolina State Board for Technical and Comprehensive Education, South Carolina Department of Mental Health, Alston Wilkes Society, University of South Carolina, Midlands Technical College, and others.

Program services offered by the professional staff of the Division of Human Services are listed in the Appendix, pages 136 through 141. New program services initiated during FY 1980 were: residential therapeutic community at WCC; Community Linkeage Program at WPRC; College Program at MCI; and additional vocational programs such as small appliance repair at MCI, food service apprenticeship at MCI, plumbing at WRCI, carpentry at GYCC, brickmasonry at GYCC, and self-instruction typing at WCC.

## Prison Industries

As of the end of FY 1980, Prison Industries in SCDC consisted of the following operations in five SCDC facilities:

Facility	Type of Industry Operations	Number of Inmates
Central Correctional Institution	Administration .....	6
	Mattress Factory .....	14
	Bookbinding .....	28
	Sign Shop .....	22
	Metal Shop .....	33
	Tag Plant .....	50
	Warehouse .....	9
	Maintenance .....	16
	Desk Factory .....	21
Sub-Total .....		199
Women's Correctional Institution	Administration .....	1
	Maintenance .....	1
	Garment Fabrication ....	62
Sub-Total .....		64
Manning Correctional Institution	Administration .....	2
	Maintenance .....	29
	Laundry Work .....	141
Sub-Total .....		172
Kirkland Correctional Institution	Administration .....	10
	Upholstery .....	66
	(1st and 2nd Shift)	
	Woodmill .....	79
	Metal Shop .....	29
	Warehouse .....	12
	Maintenance .....	10
Sub-Total .....	Truck Driver .....	1
		207
Aiken Youth Correction Center		
	Administration .....	2
	Furniture Refinishers ....	24
Sub-Total .....		26
TOTAL .....		668



Besides providing work and on-the-job training for 668 inmates, Prison Industries generated \$2.5 million dollars of sales in FY 1980. The dollar shipments of Prison Industries by month during FY 1980 is illustrated on page 49. During the year, Prison Industries were able to meet all major commitments for goods and services on a predetermined schedule.

Prison Industries also demonstrated significant improvements in managerial and operational efficiency during FY 1980. During the year, improvements were made in inventory control, quality control and scheduling. Inventory control of raw materials was strengthened and the turnover rate of raw material inventory was doubled. Financial records and practices were also updated and improved. Under a grant from LEAA, Prison Industries successfully implemented a second shift at the Furniture Factory at KCI. This not only improved the scheduling ability of that plant, but also increased the productive capacity of the plant and equipments. The fourth quarter of FY 1980 was the first quarter in the history of its operation that the Furniture Factory at KCI showed a net profit.

An especially noteworthy development in FY 1980 is Prison Industries' successful effort in expanding their market and product lines. Their sales and marketing program was expanded to include refinishing and repair of furnishings for major motels and hotels in the Columbia and Myrtle Beach areas. New contracts were also signed with major school districts and colleges throughout the state. New product lines initiated during the year include draperies for the garment factory and room dividers for the metal and furniture factories. Internally, the Division of Industries coordinated with the Division of Construction to explore for products which could and should be produced by SCDC's industries. Air vents were produced by Prison Industries during the year to meet internal construction needs.

The Division of Industries' successful expansion of products and market was achieved through increased public exposure of prison industries' operations and products. The image of Prison Industries was enhanced through tours of all industries facilities by potential customers, including purchasing agents of various government agencies and consumers. Many new orders for goods have resulted from such tours during the year. Furthermore, the Division exhibited its products in major conventions of potential customers, such as the annual meetings of the South Carolina Law Enforcement Association, the County Administrators' Annual meeting and the State Municipal Association Convention.



Prison Industries experienced a \$1,247,103 decline in sales from \$3,780,362 in FY 1979 to \$2,528,300 in FY 1980. This was primarily the result of a \$1,300,896 drop in Tag Plant sales, a \$97,564 drop in Apparel Plant sales, and an \$87,107 drop in Mattress Factory sales. The declines in these three areas, totaling \$1,485,567, together with moderate dollar sales declines in four other plants, were partially offset by sales increases in five operating areas including a \$141,251 sales gain in the CCI Metal Shop and a \$142,785 sales gain in KCI's Furniture Factory.

The sharp decline in sales of automobile license tags was primarily due to the impact of legislation reducing the number of tags required per vehicle from two (front and back) to one (rear only), and extending the time period between required vehicle tag replacement to every five years. The next major tag order will not occur until 1985. Until that time, a reduced sales volume will be sustained by orders for personalized tags, new vehicles, trucks, and shrimp trawlers.

The sales declines in the apparel and mattress areas resulted from an attempt to reduce inventories at the Commissary Warehouse as part of the Department's austerity program during FY 1980.

During this period of sharply reduced sales, mainly due to the non-controllable reduction in demand for license tags, Prison Industries was able to reduce their overall cost of goods sold from approximately 55.8% to 46.0% of sales, thereby increasing overall gross profit margins from 44.2% to 54.0%.

In spite of the substantial improvement in gross profit margins, profits declined by \$571,898. This was primarily due to a \$311,223 profit decline at the Tag Plant and a \$147,027 increased loss at the Central Laundry. These two items represented \$458,250 (or 80.1%) of the \$571,898 profit deterioration.

The drop in profits at the Tag Plant was mainly due to the \$1,300,896 sales decline there, representing a 72.2% drop in sales from the prior year. The Tag Plant's reduced level of both sales and profits is projected to continue until 1985, when the next large automobile license tag order is expected.

The \$147,027 increased loss at the Central Laundry was mainly the result of a \$144,522 (63.5%) increase in utility expenses while sales increased by only \$9,577, or 2.2%. A price increase was requested in January, 1979, to help offset the projected increase in expenses but was not approved until June, 1980, due to the ex-

tremely tight budgetary conditions and the lack of appropriations to various user agencies. A 1½¢ per pound price increase from 9½¢ to 11¢ per pound was approved effective July 1, 1980. However, it will still be insufficient to offset increases in expenses at the Laundry.

### **Agricultural Production**

FY 1980 marked the first year of agricultural programs being operated under the Division of Prison Industries as a result of reorganization in June, 1979. Farm operations are located in four SCDC facilities—WRCI, WCI, MYCC, and GYCC, and include crop, dairy and meat productions.

Agricultural production in FY 1980 was a record high, surpassing the levels for each of the last twenty years. The dollar value of farm products was slightly over one and one-half times the operational outlay of the agricultural programs. The budget for all agricultural operations was \$866,398. The value of products transferred, mainly beef, pork, and milk, was \$1,478,900.

A breakdown of farm products yielded during FY 1980 is as follows: corn—85,971 bushels; soybeans—16,302 bushels; barley—8,320 bushels; oats—14,417 bushels; rye—378 bushels; and silage—6,675 tons. The dairy produced and processed 350,928 gallons of milk for SCDC consumption. The farm also produced and shipped live weight of beef and pork totalling 392,039 and 186,620 lbs., respectively.

Such record productivity of farming operations was a result of improved planning, coordination, and management. The harvest of corn was at a rate of 181 bushels per acre and soybeans at a rate of 40 bushels per acre. Both these rates were above the corresponding production rates for these crops for the entire state. Similarly, improvements were made in both the breeding and feed programs. More than 200 acres of pasture land were reseeded in order to upgrade their quality for beef production. Plans were underway for the construction of a new dairy and cattle and equipment were acquired as surplus from Whitten Village of the Department of Mental Retardation. It is hoped that with such ongoing efforts to improve productivity and efficiency, SCDC will meet its objectives of being self-sufficient in pork production and producing 50% of its beef demand by FY 1982. SCDC is already self-sufficient in its dairy production and plans to maintain this level.

**DOLLARS SHIPMENTS BY MONTH IN THOUSANDS**  
**DIVISION OF INDUSTRIES**

Plant	July	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	April	May	June
Apparel .....	23.8	20.4	20.3	33.7	5.0	18.7	23.2	14.7	10.0	30.0	10.5	27.6
Bookbindery .....	10.3	20.8	10.0	5.2	2.1	2.5	1.3	1.0	.9	1.0	.4	4.7
Desk .....	3.1	2.4	6.2	4.9	4.7	4.5	11.4	9.3	43.7	3.8	7.7	9.2
Furniture KCI .....	27.8	60.5	31.9	51.1	30.8	34.3	36.9	51.0	62.4	67.6	65.2	66.5
Furniture AYCC-Old .....	1.2	2.3	1.4	2.6	1.8	.7	.3	.3	.005	.2	0	1.3
Laundry .....	33.9	41.1	37.7	44.7	33.8	30.6	39.1	33.6	35.1	39.9	33.1	34.6
Mattress .....	1.2	9.7	5.6	13.3	9.4	4.0	4.0	5.3	13.0	5.3	.9	30.4
Metal .....	17.7	24.8	8.3	21.1	15.6	19.3	17.3	20.1	47.4	14.1	18.0	41.9
Sign .....	10.1	13.5	10.6	21.6	7.6	9.8	7.4	4.2	11.5	13.0	5.5	9.5
Tag .....	1.0	37.3	1.9	34.1	37.4	.8	1.8	.5	100.5	41.2	34.5	203.4
Venetian Blinds .....	0	4.2	1.7	4.7	3.2	4.0	6.9	0	0	2.1	0	0
TOTALS .....	130.1	237.0	135.6	237.0	151.4	129.3	149.6	140.0	324.5	218.2	175.8	429.1

## Personnel Administration and Staff Development

A significant accomplishment in the area of personnel administration and management in FY 1980 was the reduction in the turnover rate of SCDC personnel, especially among security staff (i.e., correctional officers). Turnover rate among security staff decreased from approximately 33% in FY 1979 to 21% in FY 1980. This resulted in greater efficiency and savings as new correctional officers require extensive training at both the Criminal Justice Academy and on the job at institutions. Whereas no single reason explained this decline, improved management and supervision, improved working conditions at the institutions, increased attention to scheduling and training, and better recruitment and screening of applicants were among the suggested factors contributing to higher retention. An objective was established to further reduce the turnover rate of SCDC security staff to 18% by the end of FY 1982, and studies and efforts were ongoing to achieve this objective.

SCDC enhanced its Affirmative Action Program during FY 1980. Minority employment increased from 38% to 40% of the agency work force. Among the security staff, 18% were females. This percentage was the fourth highest among correctional agencies in the United States. To ensure SCDC meeting Affirmative Action requirements, SCDC facility and unit managers were provided orientation on the subject and given individual responsibilities for setting and achieving goals. Follow-up on the localized goal-setting process will be completed by December 31, 1980, and an Affirmative Action Plan submitted to the S. C. Human Affairs Commission.

Staff training was ongoing during FY 1980. The Staff Training Branch provided orientation for new employees, certification training for security staff, supervisory training for selected correctional officer supervisors, in-service training for SCDC employees, as well as management training for SCDC middle and top managers. During FY 1980, the Staff Training Branch conducted orientation for 375 new employees, certified 265 correctional officers, and provided in-service training to 215 additional employees. The Training Branch worked closely with the Appalachian Region to plan, develop and schedule training essential to the start-up of Dutchman and Perry Correctional Institutions.

SCDC also achieved the Budget and Control Board's specified 3.5% average merit increase for the agency. Although this had some adverse effects on employee morale, the pre-determined distribution of performance ratings provided a tool for maintaining fiscal control. SCDC personnel also demonstrated their cooperation as



they took on additional duties and extended working hours to overcome the personnel shortage resulting from a hiring freeze imposed in February, 1980, to reduce SCDC's FY 1980 budget deficit.

### **Expanded Utilization of Automated Information Systems**

Effective and efficient automated information systems have become indispensable in SCDC's management and day-to-day operations. This was particularly demonstrated in the progress in system development and integration during FY 1980.

SCDC's automated data base consists primarily of two components: the Correctional Information System, an on line system dealing with inmate data; and an off-line management information system, which is a cluster of budgetary, financial, personnel and physical plant data. Both systems were upgraded and expanded during FY 1980. In particular, the user-oriented emphases in system development and report generation have greatly facilitated the decision-making process and other management functions.

The Correctional Information System (CIS), is that component of SCDC's data base which stores, tracks, computes and retrieves all inmate identification and intake data, inter and extra institutional movements, disciplinary actions, program participation, work assignments and credits earned, parole eligibility and release, etc. Major improvements to this system and the impacts thereof are summarized as follows:

1. New terminals were installed at three SCDC facilities and one at the Probation, Parole and Pardon Board (PP&PB). This expanded SCDC's number of Cathode Ray Tube terminals to 24 and facilitated the timely entry of and access to inmate data in the field.

2. Through close communication and coordination with the PP&PB, screens and data entry procedures were completed to allow the PP&PB to make on-line inquiries and data entry pertaining to parole interviews, scheduled hearings, hearing results and future tentative parole hearing dates. This substantially reduced the requirement for mass photocopying and manual records checking by the PP&PB staff. This also eliminated the necessity of SCDC manually maintaining a parole eligibility roster.

3. Development of an automated inmate count and transfer verification system was initiated.

4. Automated calculation of inmate release and parole eligibility demonstrated the CIS's effectiveness and contribution to SCDC's management and operational efficiency. A change in good time law



effective on June 12, 1980<sup>19</sup>, necessitated the recalculation of the release dates for 6,704 inmates. Whereas a manual update would require one-half person-hour per record for a total of 3,352 person hours (an equivalence of two person-years), automated updating via a computer routine required only eight person-hours and two hours of computer time. Besides the saving in manpower resources, of even greater significance is the timely recalculation of release dates which are critical to inmate management. Without the speed and efficiency of automated calculation, accurate update of inmate records would have been delayed considerably.

5. Cautionary measures were introduced in system control to detect data entry errors in the field as well as to reject records with missing 'critical' information. Accordingly, data accuracy was significantly improved during FY 1980.

6. Inmate program participation data were in the process of being incorporated in the CIS. The Inmate Program Participation Monitoring System (IPPMS) was designed by program services staff and is near completion. Screen formats for entering educational and mental health services data were developed. Automated program service data should facilitate service planning and monitoring for both individual inmate tracking as well as for evaluation at the agency level.

To meet both internal and external management requirements, the management information data base had the following improvements during FY 1980:

1. A position management system was developed and is near completion to generate reports on vacant and filled position.
2. A new leave and attendance system was developed and implemented.
3. Inventory records were automated.
4. Budget monitoring and program budget systems were developed.
5. Equal Employment Opportunity and Affirmative Action planning data were generated.

Whereas both the CIS and management information systems underwent changes and improvements, respectively, efforts were ongoing to integrate both systems into a comprehensive data base. With a grant from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA), special manpower and computer resources were acquired

---

<sup>19</sup> See page 40, for a description of this legislative change and its implications.

to utilize the latest management and data system techniques in developing a comprehensive integrated information system. Efforts concentrated on constructing an automated data base including purchasing, inventorying, accounts payable, financial journals, canteen, and prison industries. It is anticipated that merging such a system with the Correctional Information System will facilitate the identification of full and variable costs by inmate and by institution. Such data will be crucial to SCDC in its planning and resource management functions.

### **Word Processing Center**

Word Processing Center is a new unit of the Department of Corrections which specializes in extensive, repetitive, standardized and difficult-to-revise documents. It was established to assist with the ever-increasing volume of paper work and has provided a systematized method of preparing type-written documents. At the time of tight budget and a necessity to make maximum use of available funds and personnel, SCDC's Word Processing Center, established in February, 1979, has proven to be a great savings to SCDC. Maximum utilization of personnel and equipment has been accomplished through the use of 24-hour telephone dictation and sophisticated electronic output equipment. Although the Word Processing Center consisted only of five operators and a supervisor, it has been able to cope with the extensive typing needs of SCDC headquarters.

During FY 1980, the Center produced 41,000 documents (each document is defined as one type-written page), with an average turnaround time of eight minutes per document. The average cost per document was \$1.82. Compared with the national average of \$5.59; this represented a savings of \$3.77 per page. During this total period, therefore, the cost savings was \$154,570.00. The Word Processing Center is considered one of the means through which SCDC has reduced its personnel and clerical support costs.

### **KCI Inmate Program Won International Award**

Initiated in November, 1978, by KCI Jaycees, the Sesame Street Child Care Center project provided entertainment from Sesame Street figures and other day care services such as reading assistance to children who were visiting their parents at KCI on Saturdays and Sundays. This program was supported with no expenses from SCDC funds and was supported by contributions and confiscated contraband money.

In FY 1979, the KCI Sesame Street Child Care Center Program won a significant national award, being selected as "The Most Outstanding Project of the Year" at the United States National Jaycee Convention. More honors were received in FY 1980 which brought its total number of awards to more than 50. On September 2, 1980, Governor Richard W. Riley proclaimed Kirkland Jaycee Sesame Street Recognition Day. In November, 1980, the project was selected as the United States' sole representative in the International Jaycees competition in Sweden. From 86 projects around the world, the KCI program was selected as the single most outstanding humanitarian project in the world. This set a precedent as the first correctional institution project to win the top award. The Jaycees World Congress also subsequently adopted a first-time criminal justice program worldwide. Future winners in the program will receive the Ann Riley trophy in criminal justice, named for the wife of South Carolina Governor, Richard W. Riley.

The KCI program represented the first of its kind in the nation and as Governor Riley stated, "The program has achieved to promote family unity, to provide a constructive developmental and educational curricula for the visiting program, and to help relieve the emotional and mental distress attributed to the stigma that is attached to the children of incarcerated parents . . ." Based on the success of the program at KCI, the SCDC sought and received funding to expand child care centers for three to ten year old children visiting incarcerated family members in its facilities. The grant for \$30,254 was awarded in June, 1980, with the objective of developing a program model which can be adopted to various institutions. Implemented with such a model will be a recordkeeping system for monitoring purposes and policy and procedures governing program operations.

**FEDERAL ASSISTANCE BEING RECEIVED BY OR  
APPROVED FOR THE SOUTH CAROLINA  
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS  
DURING FY 1980**

1. U. S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION (LEAA)
  - a. Action Grants through the Division of Public Safety Programs, Office of the Governor
    - (1) Extended Work Release Program: \$156,974 for July 1, 1979 to June 30, 1980.
    - (2) Improvement of Security Officer Training: \$87,403 for January 1, 1979 to December 31, 1979; \$68,815 for January 1, 1980 to December 31, 1980.
    - (3) Management Information System: Three grants to provide for personnel and other resources needed to overcome deficiencies: \$91,372 for January 1, 1979 to December 31, 1979; \$38,793 for January 1, 1979 to September 30, 1979; \$126,882 for January 1, 1980 to December 31, 1980.
    - (4) Establishment of the Coastal Regional Corrections Coordinating Office: \$20,106 for May 1, 1979 to September 30, 1979; \$28,097 for May 1, 1979 to April 30, 1980.
    - (5) Prison/Jail Standards:
      - (a) Training for local penal facility administrators and municipal and county officials in the implementation of newly developed jail and prison standards: \$19,362 for April 1, 1979 to November 30, 1979; \$35,464 for January 1, 1979 to June 30, 1980.
      - (b) Development of standards for inspection of South Carolina's juvenile detention facilities: \$99,492 for August 1, 1978 to July 31, 1979; \$70,999 for August 1, 1979 to July 31, 1980.
    - (6) Inservice training for SCDC personnel: \$11,233 for April 1, 1979 to March 31, 1980; \$8,283 for April 1, 1980 to March 31, 1981.
    - (7) Expansion and improvement of the 30-day pre-release programs at Blue Ridge Pre-Release Work Release Center and Watkins Pre-Release Center: \$21,875 for May 1, 1979 to September 30, 1979; \$30,635 for May 1, 1979 to April 30, 1980; \$44,651 for May 1, 1980 to April 30, 1981.



- (8) Provision of extra-agency community based program services to SCDC inmates: \$21,126 for June 1, 1979 to May 31, 1980; \$15,698 for June 1, 1980 to May 31, 1981.
- (9) Psychological evaluations of work release candidates: \$34,507 for October 1, 1978 to September 30, 1979; \$28,200 for October 1, 1979 to September 30, 1980.
- (10) Increased supervision of Youthful Offenders: \$156,947 for October 1, 1978 to September 30, 1979; \$133,472 for October 1, 1979 to September 30, 1980.
- (11) Staff Training and Development: Seven grants totaling \$2,870 to send professional staff to workshops and seminars for July 1, 1979 to June 30, 1980.

b. Discretionary Grants

- (1) Free Venture Project, designed to develop a self-supporting prison industry and provide ex-offenders experience for employment in private industry: \$108,981 for October 1, 1978 to May 31, 1980.
- (2) A participant-designed program for training and developing correctional managers at SCDC: \$112,288 for June 21, 1978 to October 20, 1979 (funds available through the National Institute of Corrections).
- (3) Victim Restitution Project to develop a model for victim restitution which may be used to reduce the need for institutionalization of offenders: \$24,831 for November 1, 1979 to July 31, 1980 (funds available through the National Institute of Corrections).

2. U. S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

The following grants were funded through the CETA Division, Office of the Governor, under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA):

- a. Employment Services for selected SCDC inmates, to include assessment, referral, casework support and follow-up activities for offenders entering the SCDC and the development of a comprehensive inmate tracking system: \$179,757 for October 1, 1978 to September 30, 1979; \$140,429 for October 1, 1979 to June 30, 1980.
- b. Multi-Skills Training Project providing instruction in brick masonry, carpentry, and plumbing at Kirkland Correctional Institution: \$75,730 for October 2, 1978 to September 28, 1979; \$87,538 for October 1, 1979 to September 30, 1980.

- c. Individualized Training in self-concept improvement, reading, mathematics and other complementary skills to inmates at Central Correctional Institution: \$135,118 for October 2, 1978 to September 28, 1979; \$141,576 for October 1, 1979 to September 30, 1980.
  - d. Assessment, counseling, instruction, referral, and follow-up services for incarcerated youths at five SCDC institutions: \$230,120 for October 1, 1978 to September 30, 1979; \$230,120 for October 1, 1979 to September 30, 1980.
  - e. Manpower Services Delivery Coordination Project to minimize the duplication of employment and training services through the development and implementation of a comprehensive CETA Service Delivery System for Offenders: \$19,973 for October 1, 1979 to September 30, 1980.
  - f. Placement of unemployed, under-employed and economically disadvantaged individuals on public service jobs: \$1,155,682 for October 1, 1977 to September 30, 1979 (Title VI); \$91,743 for April 1, 1979 to September 30, 1979 (Title II).
3. U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES AND U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
- a. Through the Division of Health and Social Development, Office of the Governor, funding was received to provide screening for inmates with mental retardation or other mental handicaps: \$24,871 for December 1, 1978 to November 30, 1979.
  - b. Through the South Carolina State Department of Education:
    - (1) Adult Basic Education: \$128,178 (state funds) for July 1, 1979 to June 30, 1980; \$18,365 (federal funds) for the same period.
    - (2) Title I education funds for disadvantaged youth to upgrade education programs in SCDC: \$386,129 for July 1, 1979 to June 30, 1980;
    - (3) Eight specialized vocational training programs (auto mechanics, electricity, carpentry, masonry, and welding) at Central Correctional Institution, Kirkland Correctional Institution, MacDougall Youth Correction Center, Givens Youth Correction Center, Northside Correctional Center, and the Women's Correctional Center: \$222,354 for July 1, 1979 to June 30, 1980.

- (4) Title IV funds for instructional materials and equipment: \$1,811 for November 1, 1979 to September 30, 1980.
- c. Through the U. S. Environmental Protection Agency, funding was received to upgrade wastewater facilities at Oaklawn, Travelers Rest, and Wateree Correctional Institutions, and MacDougall Youth Correction Center: \$446,271 for April 16, 1979 to December 31, 1980.
  - d. Through the S. C. Commission on Alcohol and Drug Abuse, funding was received to provide alcohol counselling treatment services for the Midlands and Appalachian Regions: \$5,959 for January 1, 1979 to December 31, 1979.
  - e. Through the S. C. State Library Board, funding was received to provide reading materials to inmates of SCDC: \$13,000 for October 1, 1979 to September 30, 1980.
  - f. Through the Executive Office of Policy and Programs, funding was received to provide internship opportunities for students: \$4,617 for June 4, 1979 to August 10, 1979; \$812 for October 1, 1979 to December 14, 1979; \$1,895 for February 1, 1980 to April 24, 1980; \$4,935 for June 6, 1980 to August 14, 1980.

**PUBLICATIONS/DOCUMENTS OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA  
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS  
DURING FY 1980<sup>20</sup>**

**Regular Reports**

Annual Report of the Board of Corrections and the Commissioner  
of the South Carolina Department of Corrections

Monthly Report to the Board of Corrections

Semi-Annual Statistical Report, Division of Resource and Informa-  
tion Management

Inmate Guide

SCDC Adjustment Committee Guide, Division of Inmate Relations

**Newsletters**

*Intercom*, quarterly newsletter prepared by the Department's Public  
Information Director for employees, inmates, and related  
organizations

*About Face*, bi-monthly newsletter prepared by the Department of  
Corrections' inmates

**Special Reports**

Inmate Construction Program

Operation Get Smart: A View of Crime and Imprisonment

Ten-Year Capital Improvements Program (For Fiscal Years 1979-80  
through 1988-89)

A Five-Year Program Plan for the South Carolina Department of  
Corrections (For Fiscal Years 1979-80 through 1983-84)

Minimum Standards for Local Detention Facilities in South Caro-  
lina, Volumes I-IV

---

<sup>20</sup> For previous SCDC publications and documents, see previous SCDC  
Annual Reports.



TABLE 2  
2000 AVERAGE HOUSEHOLD POPULATION  
BY SEX AND AGE  
CALIFORNIA

Age Group	Male	Female	Total
Under 5	1,000,000	1,000,000	2,000,000
5-9	950,000	950,000	1,900,000
10-14	900,000	900,000	1,800,000
15-19	850,000	850,000	1,700,000
20-24	800,000	800,000	1,600,000
25-29	750,000	750,000	1,500,000
30-34	700,000	700,000	1,400,000
35-39	650,000	650,000	1,300,000
40-44	600,000	600,000	1,200,000
45-49	550,000	550,000	1,100,000
50-54	500,000	500,000	1,000,000
55-59	450,000	450,000	900,000
60-64	400,000	400,000	800,000
65-69	350,000	350,000	700,000
70-74	300,000	300,000	600,000
75-79	250,000	250,000	500,000
80-84	200,000	200,000	400,000
85-89	150,000	150,000	300,000
90-94	100,000	100,000	200,000
95-99	50,000	50,000	100,000
100 and over	25,000	25,000	50,000

# STATISTICAL SECTION

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 Census of the United States, Summary Files 1 and 2. Data are based on a 100% sample of the population. The population of California is 33,871,641. The population of the United States is 281,421,906. The population of the world is 6,040,000,000.

**TABLE 2**  
**SCDC AVERAGE INMATE POPULATION**  
**1960-1980**  
**(CALENDAR YEARS)**

Year	In SCDC Facilities	In Designated Facilities <sup>1</sup>	Total Under SCDC Jurisdiction	Absolute Change Over Previous Year	Percent Change Over Previous Year
1960	2,073	...	2,073	...	...
1961	2,132	...	2,132	59	2.9
1962	2,226	...	2,226	94	4.4
1963	2,304	...	2,304	78	3.5
1964	2,378	...	2,378	74	3.2
1965	2,396	...	2,396	18	0.8
1966	2,287	...	2,287	-109	-4.6
1967	2,333	...	2,333	46	2.0
1968	2,362	...	2,362	29	1.2
1969	2,519	...	2,519	157	6.7
1970	2,705	...	2,705	186	7.4
1971	3,111	...	3,111	406	15.0
1972	3,300	...	3,300	189	6.1
1973	3,396	...	3,396	96	2.9
1974	3,931	...	3,931	535	15.8
1975	5,105	379	5,484	1,553	39.5
1976	6,064	675	6,739	1,255	22.9
1977	6,618	762	7,380	641	9.5
1978	6,838	725	7,563	183	2.5
1979	6,976	703	7,679	116	1.5
1980 <sup>2</sup>	7,283	670	7,953	274	3.6

<sup>1</sup> Since April 1, 1975, suitable county facilities have been designated as facilities to hold state inmates as a temporary measure to alleviate overcrowded conditions in SCDC facilities.

<sup>2</sup> Average calculated from January - June population figures.

FIGURE 3

SCDC AVERAGE INMATE POPULATION  
(CALENDAR YEARS 1960-1980)

Average Number  
of Inmates




TABLE 3  
SCDC AVERAGE INMATE POPULATION  
1967-1980  
(FISCAL YEARS)

Year	In SCDC Facilities	In Designated Facilities <sup>1</sup>	Total Under SCDC Jurisdiction	Absolute Change Over Previous Year	Percent Change Over Previous Year
1967	2,287	...	2,287	..	...
1968	2,378	...	2,378	91	4.0
1969	2,355	...	2,355	-23	-1.0
1970	2,537	...	2,537	182	7.7
1971	2,859	...	2,859	322	12.7
1972	3,239	...	3,239	380	13.3
1973	3,341	...	3,341	102	3.1
1974	3,542	...	3,542	201	6.0
1975	4,582	36	4,618	1,076	30.4
1976	5,696	568	6,264	1,646	35.6
1977	6,419	748	7,167	903	14.4
1978	6,709	738	7,447	280	3.9
1979	6,910	713	7,623	176	2.4
1980	7,187	682	7,869	246	3.2


<sup>1</sup> Since April 1, 1975, suitable county facilities have been designated as facilities to hold state inmates as a temporary measure to alleviate overcrowded conditions in SCDC facilities.



FIGURE 4

# SCDC AVERAGE INMATE POPULATION (FISCAL YEARS 1967-1980)

Average Number  
of Inmates




**TABLE 4**  
**PER INMATE COSTS OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA**  
**DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS**  
**FISCAL YEARS 1973-1980 <sup>1</sup>**

Fiscal Year	Based on State Funds Spent		Based on All Funds <sup>2</sup> Spent	
	Annual Per Inmate Costs	Daily Per Inmate Costs	Annual Per Inmate Costs	Daily Per Inmate Costs
1973	\$2,419	\$ 6.63	\$3,145	\$ 8.62
1974	2,886	7.91	3,707	10.16
1975	3,430	9.40	4,147	11.36
1976	3,322	9.10	4,102	11.24
1977	3,384	9.27	4,075	11.16
1978	4,114	11.27	4,826	13.22
1979	4,796	13.14	5,488	15.03
1980	4,995	13.65	5,666	15.47

<sup>1</sup> Calculation of the SCDC per inmate costs is based on the average number of inmates in SCDC facilities and does not include state inmates held in designated facilities.

<sup>2</sup> That is, state and federal funds and other revenues.

**FIGURE 5**  
**ANNUAL PER INMATE COSTS OF SCDC**  
**(FY 1973-1980)**



**TABLE 5**  
**EXPENDITURES OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA**  
**DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS**  
**FY 1980**

Office	Total Expenditures*
1. Office of the Commissioner (Includes Special Projects, Legal Advisor, Divisions of Inmate Relations, Public Information, and Internal Affairs and Inspections) .....	\$ 912,447.00
2. Administration (Includes Divisions of Industries, Support Services, Personnel Administration and Training, and Resource and Information Management) .....	5,532,934.00
3. Operations (Includes Divisions of Construction and Engineering and Maintenance, Appalachian, Midlands and Coastal Correctional Regions) .....	29,865,712.00
4. Program Services (Includes Divisions of Classification and Community Services, Human Services, and Health Services) .....	4,372,614.00
GRAND TOTAL SCDC .....	\$40,683,707.00

Source: Division of Resource and Information Management

\* Includes state appropriations, federal funds, and other revenues. Also included in these figures are employer contributions and fringe benefits.

TABLE 6

**FLOW OF OFFENDERS THROUGH THE SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS  
FISCAL YEARS 1979 AND 1980**

	Fiscal Year 1979	Fiscal Year 1980	Absolute Change	Percentage Change
<b>SCDC INMATE GAINS</b>				
New Inmates Received by MR&E Center and AR&E Center <sup>1</sup> . .	4,938	5,337	399	8.1
Direct from courts . . . . .	3,465	3,893	428	12.4
Transfers from counties . . . . .	12	8	-4	-33.3
Parole revocation . . . . .	73	135	62	84.9
Probation revocation . . . . .	-	32	32	-
YOA parole revocation . . . . .	69	52	-17	-24.6
Revocation of suspended sentence . . . . .	213	124	-89	-41.8
YOA 5b <sup>2</sup> . . . . .	130	133	3	2.3
YOA 5c <sup>2</sup> . . . . .	956	954	-2	-0.2
YOA 5d <sup>2</sup> . . . . .	1	0	-1	-100.0
Transfers from DYS <sup>3</sup> . . . . .	9	0	-9	-100.0
Transfers, ICC <sup>4</sup> . . . . .	10	6	-4	-40.0
(Women) <sup>5</sup> . . . . .	(247)	(285)	(38)	(15.4)
Other Inmates Received . . . . .	848	845	-3	-0.4
From DYS . . . . .	0	0	-	-
Safekeepers . . . . .	32	32	0	0.0
Hospital patients from counties . . . . .	580	575	-5	-0.9
Escapes returned . . . . .	171	206	35	20.5
Readmitted to count . . . . .	65	32	-33	-50.8
<b>TOTAL SCDC INMATE GAINS . . . . .</b>	<b>5,786</b>	<b>6,182</b>	<b>396</b>	<b>6.8</b>
<b>SCDC INMATE LOSSES</b>				
Released less good time <sup>6</sup> . . . . .	3,181	2,928	-253	-8.0
Released per court order . . . . .	251	251	0	0.0



	Fiscal Year 1979	Fiscal Year 1980	Absolute Change	Percentage Change
Paroled <sup>7</sup> .....	1,168	1,619	451	38.6
Pardoned .....	0	0	—	—
Escapes .....	196	218	22	11.2
Transferred to counties .....	670	601	-69	-10.3
Transferred to State Hospital .....	124	142	18	14.5
Transferred to DYS .....	0	0	—	—
Transferred, ICC .....	0	0	—	—
U.S. Marshall .....	—	2	2	—
Deaths .....	22	17	-5	-22.7
TOTAL SCDC INMATE LOSSES .....	5,612	5,778	166	3.0
NET GAIN/LOSS .....	174	404	—	—

Source: Quarterly Statistical Reports, First—Fourth Quarters, FY 1980 and Fourth Quarter, 1979.

<sup>1</sup> This category includes new inmates received by the Midlands Reception and Evaluation Center and the Appalachian Reception and Evaluation Center.

<sup>2</sup> See Section II of the Glossary for a detailed explanation of the Youthful Offender Act.

<sup>3</sup> DYS—Department of Youth Services.

<sup>4</sup> ICC—Interstate Corrections Compact; through the ICC, an offender convicted of a crime in a party state may be transferred to his home state to serve his sentence, subject to the rules and regulations of the state in which he was convicted.

<sup>5</sup> Female offenders are initially received through R & E Center for photographing and fingerprinting only; they are transferred to the Women's Correctional Center for evaluation. The number of inmates received from each category includes both males and females. The total number of females received from all categories is also reported separately in the parentheses here. When totalling the number of inmates received, the numbers appearing in parentheses should not be included since it would result in double counting of females.

<sup>6</sup> Included in this category are also youthful offenders conditionally and unconditionally released by the SCDC's Division of Classification and Community Services.

<sup>7</sup> That is, paroled by the South Carolina Probation, Parole and Pardon Board. The numbers shown in this category do not include youthful offenders paroled (or conditionally released) by the Division of Classification and Community Services' Parole Board.

**FIGURE 6**  
**RACE AND SEX OF SCDC INMATES ADMITTED**  
**DURING FY 1980**




TABLE 7

DISTRIBUTION BY COMMITTING COUNTY AND CORRECTIONAL REGION OF SCDC INMATES  
 ADMITTED DURING FY 1980  
 (JULY 1, 1979 - JUNE 30, 1980)

Committing County	Male				Female				Total		
	White		Non-White		White		Non-White		Total		Rank <sup>2</sup>
	Number	Percent <sup>1</sup>	Number	Percent <sup>1</sup>	Number	Percent <sup>1</sup>	Number	Percent <sup>1</sup>	Number	Percent <sup>1</sup>	
Appalachian Cor- rectional Region	1,115	48.2	847	34.9	92	57.9	48	32.0	2,102	41.5	—
Abbeville	11	0.5	21	0.9	2	1.3	1	0.7	35	0.7	34
Anderson	128	5.5	52	2.1	7	4.4	3	2.0	190	3.8	6
Cherokee	80	3.5	38	1.6	2	1.3	1	0.7	121	2.4	13
Edgefield	10	0.4	30	1.2	1	0.6	2	1.3	43	0.8	30
Greenville	413	17.9	372	15.3	38	23.9	24	15.9	847	16.8	1
Greenwood	56	2.4	59	2.4	5	3.1	3	2.0	123	2.4	11
Laurens	80	3.5	22	0.9	0	0.0	1	0.7	103	2.0	16
McCormick	3	0.1	11	0.5	0	0.0	1	0.7	15	0.3	46
Oconee	63	2.7	7	0.3	6	3.8	1	0.7	77	1.5	19
Pickens	96	4.2	26	1.1	15	9.4	2	1.3	139	2.8	10
Saluda	5	0.2	18	0.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	23	0.4	42
Spartanburg	170	7.3	191	7.9	16	10.1	9	6.0	386	7.6	4
Midlands Correctional Region	633	27.3	864	35.5	33	21.0	70	46.4	1,600	31.5	—
Aiken	66	2.9	67	2.8	6	3.8	2	1.3	141	2.8	9
Allendale	1	0.0*	28	1.2	0	0.0	3	2.0	32	0.6	36
Bamberg	12	0.5	19	0.8	0	0.0	3	2.0	34	0.7	35
Barnwell	15	0.6	20	0.8	0	0.0	1	0.7	36	0.7	32
Calhoun	7	0.3	10	0.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	17	0.3	44
Chester	22	1.0	40	1.6	2	1.3	0	0.0	64	1.3	22
Clarendon	7	0.3	20	0.8	0	0.0	1	0.7	28	0.6	38
Fairfield	8	0.3	17	0.7	1	0.6	2	1.3	28	0.6	38
Kershaw	25	1.1	24	1.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	49	1.0	27
Lancaster	52	2.2	37	1.5	2	1.3	2	1.3	93	1.8	17
Lee	3	0.1	13	0.5	0	0.0	1	0.7	17	0.3	44

TABLE 7—Continued

Committing County	Male				Female				Total		
	White		Non-White		White		Non-White				
	Number	Percent <sup>1</sup>	Number	Percent <sup>1</sup>	Number	Percent <sup>1</sup>	Number	Percent <sup>1</sup>	Number	Percent <sup>1</sup>	Rank <sup>2</sup>
Lexington . . . . .	80	3.5	30	1.2	1	0.6	1	0.7	112	2.2	14
Newberry . . . . .	28	1.2	47	1.9	3	1.9	5	3.3	83	1.6	18
Orangeburg . . . . .	42	1.8	67	2.8	2	1.3	12	7.9	123	2.4	11
Richland . . . . .	117	5.1	243	10.0	9	5.7	23	15.2	392	7.8	3
Sumter . . . . .	40	1.7	56	2.3	2	1.3	6	4.0	104	2.0	15
Union . . . . .	20	0.9	39	1.6	3	1.9	1	0.7	63	1.2	23
York . . . . .	88	3.8	87	3.6	2	1.3	7	4.6	184	3.6	7
Coastal Correctional Region . . . . .	565	24.3	714	29.4	34	21.3	33	21.8	1,346	26.7	—
Beaufort . . . . .	29	1.3	36	1.5	1	0.6	3	2.0	69	1.4	20
Berkeley . . . . .	27	1.2	26	1.1	0	0.0	1	0.7	54	1.1	26
Charleston . . . . .	144	6.2	255	10.5	9	5.7	7	4.6	415	8.2	2
Chesterfield . . . . .	19	0.8	20	0.8	1	0.6	4	2.6	44	0.9	29
Colleton . . . . .	23	1.0	25	1.0	1	0.6	0	0.0	49	1.0	27
Darlington . . . . .	22	1.0	36	1.5	1	0.6	0	0.0	59	1.2	24
Dillon . . . . .	17	0.7	8	0.3	0	0.0	2	1.3	27	0.5	40
Dorchester . . . . .	24	1.0	11	0.5	2	1.3	0	0.0	37	0.7	32
Florence . . . . .	91	3.9	98	4.0	7	4.4	9	6.0	205	4.1	5
Georgetown . . . . .	21	0.9	42	1.7	4	2.5	0	0.0	67	1.3	21
Hampton . . . . .	7	0.3	15	0.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	22	0.4	43
Horry . . . . .	89	3.8	46	1.9	6	3.8	4	2.6	145	2.9	8
Jasper . . . . .	10	0.4	17	0.7	1	0.6	3	2.0	31	0.6	37
Marion . . . . .	10	0.4	27	1.1	1	0.6	0	0.0	38	0.8	31
Marlboro . . . . .	26	1.1	31	1.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	57	1.1	25
Williamsburg . . . . .	6	0.3	21	0.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	27	0.5	40
Out-of-State . . . . .	0	0.0	1	0.0*	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.0*	—
TOTAL . . . . .	2,313	99.8	2,426	99.8	159	100.2	151	100.2	5,049	99.7	—

Source: Division of Resource and Information Management

\* Percentage is less than 0.1%.

<sup>1</sup> Percentage distribution may not add up to 100% due to rounding.<sup>2</sup> Ranking is in descending order according to number of commitments; the county having the largest number of total commitments is ranked number one.



FIGURE 7

INMATE ADMISSIONS BY COMMITTING COUNTY  
AND CORRECTIONAL REGION DURING FY 1980




TABLE 8

**OFFENSE DISTRIBUTION OF SCDC INMATES ADMITTED DURING FY 1980  
(JULY 1, 1979 - JUNE 30, 1980)**

Offense Classification	Male		Female		Total		
	White	Non-White	White	Non-White	Number	Percent <sup>1</sup>	Rank <sup>2</sup>
Sovereignty .....	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	—
Military .....	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	—
Immigration .....	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	—
Homicide .....	103	152	12	18	285	5.6	9
Kidnapping .....	6	8	0	1	15	0.3	28
Sexual Assault .....	18	26	0	0	44	0.9	23
Robbery .....	185	313	15	9	522	10.3	5
Assault .....	172	298	5	18	493	9.8	6
Abortion .....	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	—
Arson .....	25	9	2	1	37	0.7	24
Extortion .....	7	13	1	3	24	0.5	26
Burglary .....	348	397	5	2	752	14.9	4
Larceny .....	996	922	31	57	2,006	39.7	1
Stolen Vehicle .....	128	104	5	1	238	4.7	11
Forgery and Counterfeiting .....	143	197	29	37	406	8.0	7
Fraudulent Activities .....	126	75	57	42	300	5.9	8
Embezzlement .....	2	2	0	0	4	0.0*	32
Stolen Property .....	97	129	4	2	232	4.6	12
Damage to Property .....	63	42	3	1	109	2.2	18
Dangerous Drugs .....	484	240	51	16	791	15.7	3
Sex Offenses .....	57	48	0	0	105	2.1	19
Obscene Materials .....	1	0	0	0	1	0.0*	35
Family Offenses .....	86	103	3	3	195	3.9	13
Gambling .....	0	5	0	0	5	0.1	30
Commercialized Sex Offenses .....	0	2	0	1	3	0.0*	33

Offense Classification	Male		Female		Total		
	White	Non-White	White	Non-White	Number	Percent <sup>1</sup>	Rank <sup>2</sup>
Liquor .....	28	17	3	2	50	1.0	22
Drunkenness .....	127	114	8	3	252	5.0	10
Obstructing the Police .....	78	98	7	8	191	3.8	14
Flight/Escape .....	61	58	7	0	126	2.5	16
Obstructing Justice .....	13	37	2	4	56	1.1	21
Bribery .....	3	2	0	0	5	0.1	30
Weapon Offenses .....	80	102	3	0	185	3.7	15
Public Peace .....	42	62	11	7	122	2.4	17
Traffic Offenses .....	533	318	6	1	858	17.0	2
Health/Safety .....	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	—
Invasion of Privacy .....	10	13	0	2	25	0.5	25
Smuggling .....	3	3	0	1	7	0.1	29
Anti-Trust .....	0	0	0	1	1	0.0 <sup>a</sup>	35
Tax Revenue .....	2	0	0	0	2	0.0 <sup>a</sup>	34
Crimes Against Persons .....	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	—
Property Crimes .....	11	8	0	0	19	0.4	27
Morals/Decency Crimes .....	0	1	0	0	1	0.0 <sup>a</sup>	35
Public Order Crimes .....	49	30	1	6	86	1.7	20
TOTAL NUMBER OF OFFENSES <sup>3</sup> ..	4,087	3,948	271	247	8,553	—	—
TOTAL NUMBER OF OFFENDERS <sup>3</sup> ..	2,313	2,426	159	151	5,049	—	—

Source: Division of Resource and Information Management

<sup>a</sup> Percentage is less than 0.1%.

<sup>1</sup> Percentages in this column are based on the total number of offenders, not the total number of offenses.

<sup>2</sup> Ranking is in descending order according to offense; the offense category with the largest total number is ranked number one.

<sup>3</sup> The total number of offenses exceeds the total number of offenders because some offenders committed multiple offenses.

**FIGURE 8**  
**OFFENSES OF SDC INMATES ADMITTED**  
**DURING FY 1980**





TABLE 9

**MOST SERIOUS OFFENSE OF SCDC INMATES ADMITTED DURING FY 1980  
(JULY 1, 1979 - JUNE 30, 1980)**

Offense Classification	Male		Female		Total		
	White	Non-White	White	Non-White	Number	Percent	Rank <sup>1</sup>
Sovereignty .....	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	—
Military .....	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	—
Immigration .....	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	—
Homicide .....	95	141	11	17	264	5.2	7
Kidnapping .....	5	8	0	1	14	0.3	26
Sexual Assault .....	13	21	0	0	34	0.7	20
Robbery .....	140	222	10	7	379	7.5	5
Assault .....	108	200	4	16	328	6.5	6
Abortion .....	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	—
Arson .....	16	7	2	1	26	0.5	21
Extortion .....	3	9	1	3	16	0.3	24
Burglary .....	194	230	3	0	427	8.4	3
Larceny .....	585	614	21	44	1,264	25.0	1
Stolen Vehicle .....	78	60	4	0	142	2.8	11
Forgery and Counterfeiting .....	71	110	17	17	215	4.2	8
Fraudulent Activities .....	60	36	22	15	133	2.6	12
Embezzlement .....	1	2	0	0	3	0.1	30
Stolen Property .....	65	93	4	1	163	3.2	10
Damage to Property .....	31	24	3	1	59	1.2	17
Dangerous Drugs .....	272	144	27	11	454	9.0	2
Sex Offenses .....	51	39	0	0	90	1.8	15
Obscene Materials .....	1	0	0	0	1	0.0°	33
Family Offenses .....	73	91	2	3	169	3.3	9
Gambling .....	0	4	0	0	4	0.1	29
Commercialized Sex Offenses .....	0	1	0	0	1	0.0°	33
Liquor .....	7	5	2	1	15	0.3	25

**TABLE 9—Continued**  
**MOST SERIOUS OFFENSE OF SCDC INMATES ADMITTED DURING FY 1980**  
**(JULY 1, 1979 - JUNE 30, 1980)**

Offense Classification	Male		Female		Total		
	White	Non-White	White	Non-White	Number	Percent	Rank <sup>1</sup>
Drunkenness . . . . .	59	38	5	0	102	2.0	13
Obstructing the Police . . . . .	39	52	4	5	100	2.0	14
Flight/Escape . . . . .	11	9	5	0	25	0.5	22
Obstructing Justice . . . . .	5	12	2	1	20	0.4	23
Bribery . . . . .	1	2	0	0	3	0.1	30
Weapon Offenses . . . . .	27	41	1	0	69	1.4	16
Public Peace . . . . .	20	27	5	3	55	1.1	18
Traffic Offenses . . . . .	252	158	3	0	413	8.2	4
Health/Safety . . . . .	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	—
Invasion of Privacy . . . . .	7	4	0	1	12	0.2	27
Smuggling . . . . .	1	0	0	1	2	0.0	32
Tax Revenue . . . . .	1	0	0	0	1	0.0*	33
Crimes Against Persons . . . . .	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	—
Property Crimes . . . . .	5	4	0	0	9	0.2	28
Morals/Decency Crimes . . . . .	0	1	0	0	1	0.0*	33
Public Order Crimes . . . . .	16	17	1	2	36	0.7	19
TOTAL NUMBER OF OFFENSES . . . .	2,313	2,426	159	151	5,049	—	—
TOTAL NUMBER OF OFFENDERS . .	2,313	2,426	159	151	5,049	99.8	—

Source: Division of Resource and Information Management

\* Percentage is less than 0.1%.

<sup>1</sup> Ranking is in descending order according to offense; the offense category with the largest total number is ranked number one.

**FIGURE 9**  
**MOST SERIOUS OFFENSE OF SCDC INMATES**  
**ADMITTED DURING FY 1980**




TABLE 10

**SENTENCE LENGTH DISTRIBUTION OF SCDC INMATES ADMITTED DURING FY 1980  
(JULY 1, 1979 - JUNE 30, 1980)**

Sentence Length	Male				Female				Total	
	White		Non-White		White		Non-White			
	Number	Percent <sup>1</sup>	Number	Percent <sup>1</sup>	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent <sup>1</sup>
YOA <sup>2</sup> .....	512	22.1	417	17.1	39	24.5	16	10.6	984	19.5
3 Months or Less .....	127	5.5	129	5.3	18	11.3	15	9.9	289	5.7
3 Months 1 Day—1 Year	414	17.9	411	16.9	30	18.9	30	19.9	885	17.5
1 Year .....	174	7.5	179	7.4	15	9.4	20	13.2	388	7.7
1 Year 1 Day—2 Years	246	10.6	294	12.1	23	14.5	19	12.6	582	11.5
2 Years 1 Day—3 Years	211	9.1	215	8.9	8	5.0	14	9.3	448	8.9
3 Years 1 Day—4 Years	79	3.4	68	2.8	3	1.9	6	4.0	156	3.1
4 Years 1 Day—5 Years	120	5.2	133	5.5	3	1.9	8	5.3	264	5.2
5 Years 1 Day—6 Years	72	3.1	78	3.2	4	2.5	6	4.0	160	3.2
6 Years 1 Day—7 Years	36	1.6	51	2.1	0	0.0	2	1.3	89	1.8
7 Years 1 Day—8 Years	17	0.7	28	1.2	0	0.0	1	0.7	46	0.9
8 Years 1 Day—9 Years	40	1.7	38	1.6	1	0.6	0	0.0	79	1.6
9 Years 1 Day—10 Years	57	2.5	93	3.8	2	1.3	2	1.3	154	3.1
10 Years 1 Day—20 Years	109	4.7	131	5.4	10	6.3	5	3.3	255	5.1
20 Years 1 Day—30 Years	45	1.9	76	3.1	0	0.0	3	2.0	124	2.5
Over 30 Years .....	22	1.0	31	1.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	53	1.0
Life .....	29	1.3	53	2.2	3	1.9	4	2.6	89	1.8
Death .....	3	0.1	1	0.0*	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	0.1
TOTAL .....	2,313	99.9	2,426	99.9	159	100.0	151	100.0	5,049	100.2
Average Sentence Length <sup>3</sup> .....	4 Yrs. 4 Mos.		5 Yrs.		2 Yrs. 10 Mos.		3 Yrs.		4 Yrs. 7 Mos.	

Source: Division of Resource and Information Management

\* Percentage is less than 0.1%.

<sup>1</sup> Percentage distribution may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

<sup>2</sup> Youth Offender Act.

<sup>3</sup> This average does not include life, death and YOA sentences.



**FIGURE 10**  
**SENTENCE LENGTHS OF SCD C INMATES ADMITTED**  
**DURING FY 1980**




TABLE 11

**AGE DISTRIBUTION OF SCDC INMATES ADMITTED DURING FY 1980**  
**(JULY 1, 1979 - JUNE 30, 1980)**

Age at Time of Admission	Male				Female				Total	
	White		Non-White		White		Non-White			
	Number	Percent 1	Number	Percent 1	Number	Percent 1	Number	Percent 1	Number	Percent 1
Under 17 .....	7	0.3	11	0.5	0	0.0	1	0.7	19	0.4
17-19 .....	501	21.7	437	18.0	32	20.1	20	13.2	990	19.6
20-24 .....	719	31.1	770	31.7	54	34.0	51	33.8	1,594	31.6
25-29 .....	371	16.0	523	21.6	26	16.4	49	32.4	969	19.2
30-34 .....	254	11.0	319	13.1	14	8.8	10	6.6	597	11.8
35-39 .....	144	6.2	137	5.6	10	6.3	11	7.3	302	6.0
40-44 .....	116	5.0	80	3.3	4	2.5	3	2.0	203	4.0
45-49 .....	70	3.0	67	2.8	6	3.8	2	1.3	145	2.9
50-54 .....	68	3.0	34	1.4	9	5.7	2	1.3	113	2.2
55-59 .....	38	1.6	24	1.0	2	1.2	1	0.7	65	1.3
60-64 .....	13	0.6	14	0.6	1	0.6	0	0.0	28	0.6
65-69 .....	6	0.3	8	0.3	0	0.0	1	0.7	15	0.3
70 & Over .....	6	0.3	2	0.1	1	0.6	0	0.0	9	0.2
TOTAL .....	2,313	100.1	2,426	100.0	159	100.0	151	100.0	5,049	100.1

**Special Age Groupings**

17 .....	119	89	5	2	215
18 and Over .....	2,187	2,326	154	148	4,815
21 and Over .....	1,637	1,828	116	119	3,700
24 and Over .....	1,227	1,218	86	72	2,603
62 and Over .....	17	13	2	1	33
65 and Over .....	12	10	1	1	24
<b>Average Age .....</b>	<b>27 Yrs. 5 Mos.</b>	<b>26 Yrs. 11 Mos.</b>	<b>27 Yrs. 10 Mos.</b>	<b>26 Yrs. 6 Mos.</b>	<b>27 Yrs. 2 Mos.</b>

Source: Division of Resource and Information Management

<sup>1</sup> Percentage distribution may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

**FIGURE 11**  
**AGE GROUPS OF SCD C INMATES ADMITTED**  
**DURING FY 1980**




TABLE 12

**DISTRIBUTION BY COMMITTING PLANNING DISTRICTS OF SCDL INMATES ADMITTED  
DURING FY 1980  
(JULY 1, 1979 - JUNE 30, 1980)**

Planning Districts 1	Male				Female				Total	
	White		Non-White		White		Non-White			
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent 2	Number	Percent 2	Number	Percent 2	Number	Percent
I—Appalachian	952	41.2	687	28.3	85	53.4	40	26.5	1,764	34.9
II—Upper Savannah	164	7.1	161	6.6	8	5.0	8	5.3	341	6.8
III—Catawba	182	7.9	203	8.4	9	5.7	10	6.6	404	8.0
IV—Central Midlands	232	10.0	337	13.9	14	8.8	31	20.5	614	12.2
V—Lower Savannah	143	6.2	211	8.7	7	4.4	21	13.9	382	7.6
VI—Santee Wateree	75	3.2	113	4.6	2	1.2	8	5.3	198	3.9
VII—Pee Dee	185	8.0	220	9.1	10	6.3	15	9.9	430	8.5
VIII—Waccamaw	116	5.0	109	4.5	10	6.3	4	2.6	239	4.7
IX—Tri-County	196	8.5	291	12.0	11	6.9	8	5.3	506	10.0
X—Low Country	68	2.9	93	3.8	3	1.9	6	4.0	170	3.4
Out-of-State	0	0.0	1	0.0°	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.0°
TOTAL	2,313	100.0	2,426	99.9	159	99.9	151	99.9	5,049	100.0

Source: Division of Resource and Information Management

\* Percentage is less than 0.1%.


<sup>1</sup> Counties comprising each planning district are listed in the Appendix, page ...

<sup>2</sup> Percentage distribution may not add up to 100% due to rounding.



FIGURE 12

# COMMITTING PLANNING DISTRICTS OF SCDC INMATES ADMITTED DURING FY 1980



**TABLE 13**  
**DISTRIBUTION BY COMMITTING JUDICIAL CIRCUITS OF SCDC INMATES ADMITTED**  
**DURING FY 1980**  
**(JULY 1, 1979 - JUNE 30, 1980)**

Judicial Circuits 1		Male				Female				Total	
		White		Non-White		White		Non-White			
		Number	Percent 2	Number	Percent 2	Number	Percent 2	Number	Percent 2	Number	Percent2
1	73	3.2	88	3.6	4	2.5	12	7.9	177	3.5	
2	93	4.0	106	4.4	5	3.1	6	4.0	210	4.2	
3	56	2.4	110	4.5	2	1.2	8	5.3	176	3.5	
4	84	3.6	95	3.9	2	1.2	6	4.0	187	3.7	
5	141	6.1	267	11.0	9	5.7	23	15.2	440	8.7	
6	82	3.5	94	3.9	5	3.1	4	2.6	185	3.7	
7	251	10.8	229	9.4	18	11.3	10	6.6	508	10.1	
8	174	7.5	149	6.1	10	6.3	10	6.6	343	6.8	
9	172	7.4	280	11.5	9	5.7	8	5.3	469	9.3	
10	191	8.2	59	2.4	13	8.2	4	2.6	267	5.3	
11	98	4.2	89	3.7	2	1.2	4	2.6	193	3.8	
12	101	4.4	125	5.2	8	5.0	9	6.0	243	4.8	
13	510	22.0	399	16.4	54	34.0	26	17.2	989	19.6	
14	69	3.0	121	5.0	3	1.9	9	6.0	202	4.0	
15	110	4.8	88	3.6	10	6.3	4	2.6	212	4.2	
16	108	4.7	126	5.2	5	3.1	8	5.3	247	4.9	
Out-of-State	0	0.0	1	0.0°	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.0°	
TOTAL	2,313	99.8	2,426	99.8	159	99.8	151	99.8	5,049	100.1	

Source: Division of Resource and Information Management

\* Percentage is less than 0.1%.

1 Counties comprising each judicial circuit are listed in the Appendix, page ..

2 Percentage distribution may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

FIGURE 13  
COMMITTING JUDICIAL CIRCUITS OF SCDC  
INMATES ADMITTED DURING FY 1980




FIGURE 14  
RACE AND SEX OF SCD C INMATES,  
AS OF JUNE 28, 1980






TABLE 14

DISTRIBUTION BY COMMITTING COUNTY AND CORRECTIONAL REGION OF SCDC TOTAL  
INMATE POPULATION, AS OF JUNE 28, 1980

Committing County	Male				Female				Total		
	White		Non-White		White		Non-White				
	Number	Percent <sup>1</sup>	Number	Percent <sup>1</sup>	Number	Percent <sup>1</sup>	Number	Percent <sup>1</sup>	Number	Percent <sup>1</sup>	Rank <sup>2</sup>
Appalachian Correctional Region	1,468	44.1	1,267	28.7	81	51.2	61	32.3	2,877	35.6	—
Abbeville	18	0.5	44	1.0	1	0.6	3	1.6	66	0.8	31
Anderson	197	5.9	106	2.4	9	5.7	6	3.2	318	3.9	7
Cherokee	85	2.6	41	0.9	3	1.9	1	0.5	130	1.6	17
Edgefield	7	0.2	45	1.0	1	0.6	1	0.5	54	0.7	34
Greenville	485	14.6	458	10.4	31	19.6	18	9.5	992	12.3	1
Greenwood	70	2.1	114	2.6	5	3.2	6	3.2	195	2.4	13
Laurens	77	2.3	47	1.1	1	0.6	4	2.1	129	1.6	18
McCormick	4	0.1	17	0.4	0	0.0	2	1.1	23	0.3	45
Oconee	91	2.7	18	0.4	4	2.5	2	1.1	115	1.4	21
Pickens	172	5.2	53	1.2	6	3.8	1	0.5	232	2.9	10
Saluda	9	0.3	18	0.4	0	0.0	1	0.5	28	0.3	44
Spartanburg	253	7.6	306	6.9	20	12.7	16	8.5	595	7.4	4
Midlands Correctional Region	980	29.7	1,632	37.0	38	24.1	80	42.1	2,730	33.8	—
Aiken	112	3.4	123	2.8	7	4.4	1	0.5	243	3.0	9
Allendale	3	0.1	33	0.7	0	0.0	3	1.6	39	0.5	41
Bamberg	17	0.5	33	0.7	0	0.0	1	0.5	51	0.6	37
Barnwell	17	0.5	23	0.5	0	0.0	1	0.5	41	0.5	40
Calhoun	10	0.3	19	0.4	0	0.0	1	0.5	30	0.4	43
Chester	32	1.0	60	1.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	92	1.1	26
Clarendon	13	0.4	40	0.9	0	0.0	1	0.5	54	0.7	34
Fairfield	15	0.5	29	0.7	0	0.0	1	0.5	45	0.6	39
Kershaw	35	1.1	55	1.2	0	0.0	1	0.5	91	1.1	27
Lancaster	79	2.4	65	1.5	2	1.3	1	0.5	147	1.8	15
Lee	6	0.2	30	0.7	1	0.6	1	0.5	38	0.5	42
Lexington	108	3.3	69	1.6	0	0.0	2	1.1	179	2.2	14
Newberry	34	1.0	73	1.7	5	3.2	7	3.7	119	1.5	19

TABLE 14—Continued

**DISTRIBUTION BY COMMITTING COUNTY AND CORRECTIONAL REGION OF SCDL TOTAL  
INMATE POPULATION, AS OF JUNE 28, 1980**

		Male				Female				Total		
		White		Non-White		White		Non-White				
Committing County	Number	Percent <sup>1</sup>	Number	Percent <sup>1</sup>	Number	Percent <sup>1</sup>	Number	Percent <sup>1</sup>	Number	Percent <sup>1</sup>	Rank <sup>2</sup>	
06	Orangeburg .....	48	1.4	141	3.2	5	3.2	15	7.9	209	2.6	11
	Richland .....	190	5.7	482	10.9	7	4.4	27	14.3	706	8.7	3
	Sumter .....	65	2.0	123	2.8	4	2.5	6	3.2	198	2.4	12
	Union .....	35	1.1	50	1.1	5	3.2	4	2.1	94	1.2	25
	York .....	161	4.8	184	4.2	2	1.3	7	3.7	354	4.4	5
	Coastal Correctional Region .....	864	25.8	1,507	34.1	39	24.6	48	25.3	2,458	30.4	—
	Beaufort .....	61	1.8	75	1.7	1	0.6	4	2.1	141	1.7	16
	Berkeley .....	38	1.1	42	1.0	0	0.0	1	0.5	81	1.0	30
	Charleston .....	222	6.7	521	11.8	12	7.6	15	7.9	770	9.5	2
	Chesterfield .....	21	0.6	39	0.9	1	0.6	3	1.6	64	0.8	32
	Colleton .....	30	0.9	59	1.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	89	1.1	28
	Darlington .....	35	1.1	76	1.7	2	1.3	3	1.6	116	1.4	20
	Dillon .....	21	0.6	33	0.7	0	0.0	3	1.6	57	0.7	33
	Dorchester .....	50	1.5	47	1.1	4	2.5	0	0.0	101	1.2	23
	Florence .....	113	3.4	183	4.1	4	2.5	8	4.2	308	3.8	8
	Georgetown .....	24	0.7	79	1.8	3	1.9	0	0.0	106	1.3	22
	Hampton .....	8	0.2	13	0.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	21	0.3	46
	Horry .....	159	4.8	146	3.3	8	5.1	8	4.2	321	4.0	6
	Jasper .....	19	0.6	22	0.5	2	1.3	3	1.6	46	0.6	38
	Marion .....	28	0.8	66	1.5	1	0.6	0	0.0	95	1.2	24
	Marlboro .....	28	0.8	59	1.3	1	0.6	0	0.0	88	1.1	29
	Williamsburg .....	7	0.2	47	1.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	54	0.7	34
	Out-of-State .....	11	0.3	11	0.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	22	0.3	—
	TOTAL .....	3,323	99.9	4,417	100.1	158	99.9	189	99.7	8,087	100.1	

Source: Division of Resource and Information Management

<sup>1</sup> Percentage distribution may not add up to 100% due to rounding.<sup>2</sup> Ranking is in descending order according to number of commitments; the county having the largest number of total commitments is ranked number one.

FIGURE 15

COMMITTING COUNTY AND CORRECTIONAL REGION OF SCDC  
INMATE POPULATION, AS OF JUNE 28, 1980




TABLE 15

TYPE OF OFFENSE DISTRIBUTION OF SCDC TOTAL INMATE POPULATION,  
AS OF JUNE 28, 1980

Offense Classification	Male		Female		Total		
	White	Non-White	White	Non-White	Number	Percent <sup>1</sup>	Rank <sup>2</sup>
Sovereignty .....	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	—
Military .....	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	—
Immigration .....	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	—
Homicide .....	461	826	47	71	1,405	17.4	3
Kidnapping .....	28	24	1	1	54	0.7	21
Sexual Assault .....	138	274	1	0	413	5.1	10
Robbery .....	615	1,416	29	35	2,095	25.9	2
Assault .....	404	722	11	25	1,162	14.4	5
Abortion .....	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	—
Arson .....	50	26	2	0	78	1.0	20
Extortion .....	7	11	1	2	21	0.2	27
Burglary .....	639	726	6	3	1,374	17.0	4
Larceny .....	1,755	1,583	25	50	3,413	42.2	1
Stolen Vehicle .....	211	185	5	2	403	5.0	11
Forgery and Counterfeiting .....	251	259	31	54	595	7.4	9
Fraudulent Activities .....	121	64	35	26	246	3.0	14
Embezzlement .....	6	2	0	0	8	0.1	29
Stolen Property .....	141	196	5	2	344	4.2	12
Damage to Property .....	85	60	2	1	148	1.8	18
Dangerous Drugs .....	545	384	31	23	983	12.2	6
Sex Offenses .....	91	88	1	0	180	2.2	16
Obscene Materials .....	1	1	0	0	2	0.0°	32
Family Offenses .....	58	48	4	1	111	1.4	19
Gambling .....	1	2	0	0	3	0.0°	31
Commercialized Sex Offenses .....	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	—
Liquor .....	12	5	1	2	20	0.2	28

Offense Classification	Male		Female		Total		
	White	Non-White	White	Non-White	Number	Percent <sup>1</sup>	Rank <sup>2</sup>
Drunkenness .....	14	30	0	0	44	0.5	22
Obstructing the Police .....	81	89	2	1	173	2.1	17
Flight/Escape .....	430	248	17	7	702	8.7	7
Obstructing Justice .....	13	20	0	3	36	0.4	23
Bribery .....	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	—
Weapon Offenses .....	141	187	6	2	336	4.2	12
Public Peace .....	11	19	1	0	31	0.4	24
Traffic Offenses .....	416	218	0	0	634	7.8	8
Health/Safety .....	1	0	0	0	1	0.0°	34
Civil Rights .....	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	—
Invasion of Privacy .....	2	5	0	0	7	0.0°	30
Smuggling .....	15	12	0	0	27	0.3	25
Anti-Trust .....	0	0	1	0	1	0.0°	34
Tax Revenue .....	2	0	0	0	2	0.0°	32
Conservation .....	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	—
Vagrancy .....	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	—
Crimes Against Persons .....	0	1	0	0	1	0.0°	34
Property Crimes .....	16	10	0	0	26	0.3	26
Morals/Decency Crimes .....	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	—
Public Order Crimes .....	129	69	1	8	207	2.6	15
TOTAL NUMBER OF OFFENSES <sup>3</sup> .....	6,891	7,810	266	319	15,286	—	—
TOTAL NUMBER OF OFFENDERS <sup>3</sup> .....	3,323	4,417	158	189	8,087	—	—

Source: Division of Resource and Information Management

° Percentage is less than 0.1%.

<sup>1</sup> Percentages in this column are based on the total number of offenders, not the total number of offenses.

<sup>2</sup> Ranking is in descending order according to offense; the offense category with the largest total number is ranked number one.

<sup>3</sup> The total number of offenses exceeds the total number of offenders because some offenders committed multiple offenses.



**FIGURE 16**  
**OFFENSES OF SCDC TOTAL INMATE POPULATION,**  
**AS OF JUNE 28, 1980**



TABLE 16

MOST SERIOUS OFFENSE DISTRIBUTION OF SCDC TOTAL INMATE POPULATION,  
AS OF JUNE 28, 1980

Offense Classification	Male		Female		Total		
	White	Non-White	White	Non-White	Number	Percent	Rank <sup>1</sup>
Sovereignty .....	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	—
Military .....	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	—
Immigration .....	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	—
Homicide .....	423	770	46	67	1,306	16.1	3
Kidnapping .....	23	22	1	1	47	0.6	19
Sexual Assault .....	103	223	0	0	326	4.0	7
Robbery .....	437	973	22	26	1,458	18.0	2
Assault .....	197	369	8	16	590	7.3	5
Abortion .....	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	—
Arson .....	26	17	1	0	44	0.5	20
Extortion .....	3	8	1	2	14	0.2	23
Burglary .....	295	358	3	1	657	8.1	4
Larceny .....	848	809	16	30	1,703	21.1	1
Stolen Vehicle .....	90	85	4	1	180	2.2	11
Forgery and Counterfeiting .....	96	125	15	23	259	3.2	8
Fraudulent Activities .....	40	21	11	4	76	0.9	13
Embezzlement .....	1	1	0	0	2	0.0°	30
Stolen Property .....	79	108	5	1	193	2.4	10
Damage to Property .....	25	29	2	1	57	0.7	18
Dangerous Drugs .....	260	188	14	11	473	5.8	6
Sex Offenses .....	76	67	0	0	143	1.8	12
Obscene Materials .....	1	0	0	0	1	0.0°	31
Family Offenses .....	33	37	2	1	73	0.9	14
Gambling .....	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	—
Commercialized Sex Offenses .....	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	—
Liquor .....	1	1	1	1	4	0.0°	27

TABLE 16—Continued

**MOST SERIOUS OFFENSE DISTRIBUTION OF SCDC TOTAL INMATE POPULATION,  
AS OF JUNE 28, 1980**

Offense Classification	Male		Female		Total		
	White	Non-White	White	Non-White	Number	Percent	Rank <sup>1</sup>
Drunkenness . . . . .	6	10	0	0	16	0.2	21
Obstructing the Police . . . . .	33	38	1	0	72	0.9	15
Flight/Escape . . . . .	10	2	3	0	15	0.2	22
Obstructing Justice . . . . .	4	3	0	1	8	0.1	25
Bribery . . . . .	1	3	0	0	4	0.0*	27
Weapon Offenses . . . . .	24	34	1	0	59	0.7	17
Public Peace . . . . .	4	7	1	0	12	0.1	24
Traffic Offenses . . . . .	142	77	0	0	219	2.7	9
Health/Safety . . . . .	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	—
Civil Rights . . . . .	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	—
Invasion of Privacy . . . . .	1	2	0	0	3	0.0*	29
Smuggling . . . . .	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	—
Anti-Trust . . . . .	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	—
Tax Revenue . . . . .	1	0	0	0	1	0.0*	31
Conservation . . . . .	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	—
Vagrancy . . . . .	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	—
Crimes Against Persons . . . . .	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	—
Property Crimes . . . . .	5	3	0	0	8	0.1	25
Morals/Decency Crimes . . . . .	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	—
Public Order Crimes . . . . .	35	27	0	2	64	0.8	16
TOTAL NUMBER OF OFFENSES . . . . .	3,323	4,417	158	189	8,087	—	—
TOTAL NUMBER OF OFFENDERS . . . . .	3,323	4,417	158	189	8,087	99.6	—

Source: Division of Resource and Information Management

\* Percentage is less than 0.1%.

<sup>1</sup> Ranking is in descending order according to offense; the offense category with the largest total number is ranked number one.

**FIGURE 17**  
**MOST SERIOUS OFFENSE OF SCDC TOTAL INMATE**  
**POPULATION, AS OF JUNE 28, 1980**



TABLE 17

## SENTENCE LENGTH DISTRIBUTION OF SCDC TOTAL INMATE POPULATION, AS OF JUNE 28, 1980

Sentence Length	Male				Female				Total	
	White		Non-White		White		Non-White			
	Number	Percent <sup>1</sup>	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent <sup>1</sup>
YOA <sup>2</sup>	446	13.4	365	8.3	33	20.9	15	7.9	859	10.6
3 Months or Less	6	0.2	19	0.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	25	0.3
3 Months 1 Day—1 Year	122	3.7	112	2.5	8	5.1	9	4.8	251	3.1
1 Year	96	2.9	93	2.1	10	6.3	11	5.8	210	2.6
1 Year 1 Day—2 Years	197	5.9	268	6.1	15	9.5	13	6.9	493	6.1
2 Years 1 Day—3 Years	275	8.3	302	6.8	10	6.3	20	10.6	607	7.5
3 Years 1 Day—4 Years	133	4.0	122	2.8	4	2.5	8	4.2	267	3.3
4 Years 1 Day—5 Years	242	7.3	287	6.5	6	3.8	14	7.4	549	6.8
5 Years 1 Day—6 Years	170	5.1	203	4.6	5	3.2	11	5.8	389	4.8
6 Years 1 Day—7 Years	101	3.0	129	2.9	3	1.9	5	2.6	238	2.9
7 Years 1 Day—8 Years	70	2.1	83	1.9	3	1.9	3	1.6	159	2.0
8 Years 1 Day—9 Years	97	2.9	126	2.9	1	0.6	1	0.5	225	2.8
9 Years 1 Day—10 Years	211	6.3	334	7.6	8	5.1	13	6.9	566	7.0
10 Years 1 Day—20 Years	537	16.2	837	18.9	28	17.7	40	21.2	1,442	17.8
20 Years 1 Day—30 Years	244	7.3	495	11.2	6	3.8	10	5.3	755	9.3
Over 30 Years	133	4.0	292	6.6	3	1.9	2	1.1	430	5.3
Life	235	7.1	346	7.8	15	9.5	14	7.4	610	7.5
Death	8	0.2	4	0.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	12	0.1
TOTAL	3,323	99.9	4,417	100.0	158	100.0	189	100.0	8,087	99.8
Average Sentence Length <sup>3</sup>	11 Yrs.		12 Yrs. 10 Mos.		8 Yrs. 8 Mos.		8 Yrs. 8 Mos.		11 Yrs. 11 Mos.	


Source: Division of Resource and Information Management

<sup>1</sup> Percentage distribution may not add up to 100% due to rounding.<sup>2</sup> Youthful Offender Act.<sup>3</sup> This average does not include life, death sentences and YOA.



FIGURE 18

## SENTENCE LENGTHS OF SCDC TOTAL INMATE POPULATION, AS OF JUNE 28, 1980



**TABLE 18**  
**AGE DISTRIBUTION OF SCDC TOTAL INMATE POPULATION, AS OF JUNE 28, 1980**

Age¹		Male				Female				Total	
		White		Non-White		White		Non-White			
		Number	Percent 2	Number	Percent 2	Number	Percent 2	Number	Percent 2	Number	Percent 2
Under 17	0	0.0	5	0.1	0	0.0	1	0.5	6	0.1	
17-19	375	11.3	370	8.4	18	11.4	12	6.3	775	9.6	
20-24	1,059	31.9	1,302	29.5	53	33.5	53	28.0	2,467	30.5	
25-29	699	21.0	1,187	26.9	28	17.7	57	30.2	1,971	24.4	
30-34	440	13.2	807	18.3	20	12.6	28	14.8	1,295	16.0	
35-39	274	8.2	308	7.0	14	8.9	13	6.9	609	7.5	
40-44	177	5.3	160	3.6	10	6.3	9	4.8	356	4.4	
45-49	127	3.8	119	2.7	9	5.7	9	4.8	264	3.3	
50-54	89	2.7	63	1.4	4	2.5	1	0.5	157	1.9	
55-59	40	1.2	43	1.0	0	0.0	5	2.6	88	1.1	
60-64	18	0.5	28	0.6	2	1.3	0	0.0	48	0.6	
65-69	15	0.4	17	0.4	0	0.0	1	0.5	33	0.4	
70 & Over	10	0.3	8	0.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	18	0.2	
TOTAL	3,323	99.8	4,417	100.1	158	99.9	189	99.9	8,087	100.0	
Special Age Groupings											
17	61		39		3		1		104		
18 and Over	3,262		4,373		155		187		7,977		
21 and Over	2,717		3,805		128		167		6,817		
24 and Over	1,434		1,677		71		64		3,246		
62 and Over	35		36		1		1		73		
65 and Over	25		25		0		1		51		
Average Age	28 Yrs. 10 Mos.		28 Yrs. 5 Mos.		28 Yrs. 9 Mos.		29 Yrs. 2 Mos.		28 Yrs. 7 Mos.		

Source: Division of Resource and Information Management

<sup>1</sup> This distribution reflects the age of inmates as of June 28, 1980.

<sup>2</sup> Percentage distribution may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

FIGURE 19

AGE GROUPS OF SCDC TOTAL INMATE  
POPULATION, AS OF JUNE 28, 1980




TABLE 19

**AGE AT TIME OF ADMISSION OF SCDL TOTAL INMATE POPULATION,  
AS OF JUNE 28, 1980**

Age <sup>1</sup>	Male				Female				Total	
	White		Non-White		White		Non-White			
	Number	Percent 2	Number	Percent 2	Number	Percent 2	Number	Percent 2	Number	Percent 2
Under 17 .....	7	0.2	17	0.4	0	0.0	1	0.5	25	0.3
17-19 .....	695	20.9	890	20.1	31	19.6	24	12.7	1,640	20.3
20-24 .....	,091	32.8	1,522	34.4	50	31.6	65	34.4	2,728	33.7
25-29 .....	591	17.8	969	21.9	28	17.7	50	26.4	1,638	20.2
30-34 .....	349	10.5	488	11.0	17	10.8	18	9.5	872	10.8
35-39 .....	209	6.3	211	4.8	14	8.9	10	5.3	444	5.5
40-44 .....	166	5.0	122	2.8	9	5.7	9	4.8	306	3.8
45-49 .....	106	3.2	94	2.1	4	2.5	5	2.6	209	2.6
50-54 .....	53	1.6	38	0.9	3	1.9	3	1.6	97	1.2
55-59 .....	30	0.9	35	0.8	1	0.6	3	1.6	69	0.8
60-64 .....	12	0.4	18	0.4	1	0.6	0	0.0	31	0.4
65-69 .....	8	0.2	12	0.3	0	0.0	1	0.5	21	0.2
70 & Over .....	6	0.2	1	0.0*	0	0.0	0	0.0	7	0.0
TOTAL .....	3,323	100.0	4,417	99.9	158	99.9	189	99.9	8,087	99.8
Special Age Groupings										
17 .....	151		208		6		3		368	
18 and Over .....	3,165		4,192		151		185		7,693	
21 and Over .....	2,349		3,192		120		155		5,816	
24 and Over .....	1,793		2,429		81		90		4,393	
62 and Over .....	20		23		1		1		45	
65 and Over .....	14		13		0		1		28	
Average Age .....	26 Yrs. 10 Mos.		25 Yrs. 10 Mos.		27 Yrs. 4 Mos.		27 Yrs. 6 Mos.		26 Yrs. 4 Mos.	

Source: Division of Resource and Information Management


\* Percentage is less than 0.1%.

<sup>1</sup> This distribution reflects the age of inmates as of June 28, 1980.

<sup>2</sup> Percentage distribution may not add up to 100% due to rounding.


FIGURE 20

AGE AT TIME OF ADMISSION OF SCDC TOTAL  
INMATE POPULATION, AS OF JUNE 28, 1980





**FIGURE 21**  
**LOCATION OF SCDC INMATES, AS OF JUNE 28, 1980**



\*These are inmates assigned to the Criminal Justice Academy, SLED Headquarters, the State Park Health Center, and the Governor's Mansion.

Division of Resource and Information Management

TABLE 20

**CUSTODY GRADE DISTRIBUTION BY COMMITTING CORRECTIONAL REGION, RACE AND  
SEX OF SCDC TOTAL INMATE POPULATION, AS OF JUNE 28, 1980**


Custody Grades	Male				Female				Total	
	White		Non-White		White		Non-White			
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent1	Number	Percent1	Number	Percent1	Number	Percent1
Appalachian Correctional Region										
AA Trusty .....	109	7.4	107	8.4	22	27.2	23	37.7	261	9.1
A Trusty .....	701	47.8	610	48.1	14	17.3	5	8.2	1,330	46.2
B Medium .....	492	33.5	466	36.8	40	49.4	33	54.1	1,031	35.8
C Close .....	155	10.6	76	6.0	5	6.2	0	0.0	236	8.2
M Maximum .....	11	0.7	4	0.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	15	0.5
Records in Process	0	0.0	4	0.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	0.1
TOTAL .....	1,468	100.0	1,267	99.9	81	100.1	61	100.0	2,877	99.9
Midlands Correctional Region										
AA Trusty .....	182	18.6	259	15.9	7	18.4	22	27.5	470	17.2
A Trusty .....	331	33.8	624	38.2	5	13.2	12	15.0	972	35.6
B Medium .....	345	35.2	607	37.2	26	68.4	46	57.5	1,024	37.5
C Close .....	110	11.2	124	7.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	234	8.6
M Maximum .....	10	1.0	14	0.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	24	0.9
Records in Process	1	0.1	4	0.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	0.2
TOTAL .....	979	99.9	1,632	99.9	38	100.0	80	100.0	2,729	100.0
Coastal Correctional Region										
AA Trusty .....	129	14.9	244	16.2	18	46.2	22	45.8	413	16.8
A Trusty .....	349	40.3	626	41.5	1	2.6	4	8.3	980	39.8
B Medium .....	275	31.8	528	35.0	19	48.7	20	41.7	842	34.2

Custody Grades	Male				Female				Total	
	White		Non-White		White		Non-White			
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent <sup>1</sup>	Number	Percent <sup>1</sup>	Number	Percent <sup>1</sup>	Number	Percent <sup>1</sup>
C Close .....	102	11.8	95	6.3	1	2.6	2	4.2	200	8.1
M Maximum .....	8	0.9	10	0.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	18	0.7
Records in Process .....	2	0.2	4	0.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	0.2
TOTAL .....	865	99.9	1,507	100.0	39	100.1	48	100.0	2,459	99.8
Out-of-State and										
AA Trusty .....	1	9.1	2	18.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	13.6
A Trusty .....	2	18.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	9.1
B Medium .....	6	54.5	9	81.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	15	68.2
C Close .....	2	18.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	9.1
M Maximum .....	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Records in Process .....	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
TOTAL .....	11	100.0	11	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	22	100.0
SCDC Total										
AA Trusty .....	421	12.7	612	13.8	47	29.7	67	35.4	1,147	14.2
A Trusty .....	1,383	41.6	1,860	42.1	20	12.6	21	11.1	3,284	40.6
B Medium .....	1,118	33.6	1,610	36.4	85	53.8	99	52.4	2,912	36.0
C Close .....	369	11.1	295	6.7	6	3.8	2	1.0	672	8.3
M Maximum .....	29	0.9	28	0.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	57	0.7
Records in Process .....	3	0.1	12	0.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	15	0.2
TOTAL .....	3,323	100.0	4,417	99.9	158	99.9	189	99.9	8,087	100.0

Source: Division of Resource and Information Management

<sup>1</sup> Percentage distribution may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

**FIGURE 22**  
**CUSTODY GRADES OF SCDC TOTAL INMATE**  
**POPULATION, AS OF JUNE 28, 1980**



**TABLE 21**  
**COMMITTING PLANNING DISTRICTS OF SCDC TOTAL INMATE POPULATION,**  
**AS OF JUNE 28, 1980**

Planning Districts 1	Male				Female				Total	
	White		Non-White		White		Non-White			
	Number	Percent2	Number	Percent2	Number	Percent2	Number	Percent	Number	Percent2
I—Appalachian . . . . .	1,284	38.6	982	22.2	74	46.8	44	23.3	2,384	29.5
II—Lower Savannah . . . . .	185	5.6	285	6.4	8	5.1	17	9.0	495	6.1
III—Catawba . . . . .	307	9.2	359	8.1	9	5.7	12	6.3	687	8.5
IV—Central Midlands . . . . .	346	10.4	653	14.8	12	7.6	37	19.6	1,048	13.0
V—Lower Savannah . . . . .	207	6.2	372	8.4	11	7.0	22	11.6	612	7.6
VI—Santee Wateree . . . . .	119	3.6	248	5.6	5	3.2	9	4.8	381	4.7
VII—Pee Dee . . . . .	246	7.4	456	10.3	9	5.7	17	9.0	728	9.0
VIII—Waccamaw . . . . .	190	5.7	272	6.2	11	7.0	8	4.2	481	5.9
IX—Tri-County . . . . .	310	9.3	610	13.8	16	10.1	16	8.5	952	11.8
X—Low Country . . . . .	118	3.6	169	3.8	3	1.9	7	3.7	297	3.7
Out-of-State . . . . .	11	0.3	11	0.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	22	0.3
TOTAL . . . . .	3,323	99.9	4,417	99.8	158	100.1	189	100.0	8,087	100.1

Source: Division of Resource and Information Management


<sup>1</sup> Counties comprising each planning district are listed in the Appendix, page 140.

<sup>2</sup> Percentage distribution may not add up to 100% due to rounding.



FIGURE 23

COMMITTING PLANNING DISTRICTS OF SCDL TOTAL INMATE POPULATION,  
AS OF JUNE 28, 1980



**TABLE 22**  
**COMMITTING JUDICIAL CIRCUITS OF SCDC TOTAL INMATE POPULATION,**  
**AS OF JUNE 28, 1980**

Judicial Circuits 1		Male				Female				Total	
		White		Non-White		White		Non-White			
		Number	Percent2	Number	Percent2	Number	Percent	Number	Percent2	Number	Percent
1	.....	108	3.2	207	4.7	9	5.7	16	8.5	340	4.2
2	.....	146	4.4	179	4.0	6	3.8	3	1.6	334	4.1
3	.....	91	2.7	240	5.4	5	3.2	8	4.2	344	4.2
4	.....	105	3.2	207	4.7	4	2.5	9	4.8	325	4.0
5	.....	225	6.8	537	12.2	7	4.4	28	14.8	797	9.8
6	.....	126	3.8	154	3.5	2	1.3	2	1.0	284	3.5
7	.....	338	10.2	347	7.8	23	14.6	17	9.0	725	9.0
8	.....	199	6.0	278	6.3	12	7.6	20	10.6	509	6.3
9	.....	260	7.8	563	12.7	12	7.6	16	8.5	851	10.5
10	.....	288	8.7	124	2.8	13	8.2	8	4.2	433	5.4
11	.....	127	3.8	149	3.4	1	0.6	6	3.2	283	3.5
12	.....	141	4.2	249	5.6	5	3.2	8	4.2	403	5.0
13	.....	658	19.8	511	11.6	38	24.0	19	10.0	1,226	15.2
14	.....	121	3.6	202	4.6	3	1.9	10	5.3	336	4.2
15	.....	183	5.5	225	5.1	11	7.0	8	4.2	427	5.3
16	.....	196	5.9	234	5.3	7	4.4	11	5.8	448	5.5
Out-of-State	.....	11	0.3	11	0.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	22	0.3
TOTAL .....		3,323	99.9	4,417	99.9	158	100.0	189	99.9	8,087	100.0

Source: Division of Resource and Information Management

<sup>1</sup> Counties comprising each judicial circuit are listed in the Appendix, page 141.

<sup>2</sup> Percentage distribution may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

**FIGURE 24**  
**COMMITTING JUDICIAL CIRCUITS OF SCDC**  
**TOTAL INMATE POPULATION,**  
**AS OF JUNE 28, 1980**




TABLE 23

## REMAINING TIME TO SERVE OF SCDC TOTAL INMATE POPULATION, AS OF JUNE 28, 1980


Remaining Time <sup>1</sup> To Serve	Male				Female				Total	
	White		Non-White		White		Non-White		Number	Percent <sup>2</sup>
	Number	Percent <sup>2</sup>	Number	Percent <sup>2</sup>	Number	Percent <sup>2</sup>	Number	Percent		
Youthful Offender (indeterminant sentence)	483	14.5	389	8.8	35	22.2	16	8.5	923	11.4
3 months or less	208	6.2	239	5.4	12	7.6	17	9.0	476	5.9
3 months 1 day—6 months	185	5.6	241	5.4	17	10.8	16	8.5	459	5.7
6 months 1 day—9 months	155	4.7	173	3.9	6	3.8	6	3.2	340	4.2
9 months 1 day—12 months	145	4.4	177	4.0	7	4.4	11	5.8	340	4.2
1 year 1 day—2 years	447	13.4	562	12.7	11	7.0	31	16.4	1,051	13.0
2 years 1 day—3 years	312	9.4	412	9.3	12	7.6	18	9.5	754	9.3
3 years 1 day—4 years	264	7.9	351	7.9	9	5.7	7	3.7	631	7.8
4 years 1 day—5 years	180	5.4	279	6.3	6	3.8	16	8.5	481	5.9
5 years 1 day—6 years	133	4.0	208	4.7	6	3.8	13	6.9	360	4.4
6 years 1 day—7 years	111	3.3	153	3.5	6	3.8	5	2.6	275	3.4
7 years 1 day—8 years	79	2.4	178	4.0	2	1.3	3	1.6	262	3.2
8 years 1 day—9 years	71	2.1	141	3.2	3	1.9	7	3.7	222	2.7
9 years 1 day—10 years	72	2.2	106	2.4	3	1.9	4	2.1	185	2.3
10 years 1 day—15 years	184	5.5	355	8.0	6	3.8	4	2.1	549	6.8
15 years 1 day—20 years	30	0.9	80	1.8	1	0.6	0	0.0	111	1.4
20 years 1 day—30 years	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Life/Death	264	7.9	373	8.4	16	10.1	15	7.9	668	8.3
Total Number of Inmates	3,323	99.8	4,417	99.7	158	100.1	189	100.0	8,087	99.9
Average Time <sup>3</sup> to Serve	3 yrs. 7 mos.		4 yrs. 4 mos.		3 yrs. 2 mos.		3 yrs. 1 mo.		4 yrs.	

Source: Division of Resource and Information Management

<sup>1</sup> Full impact for statutory, meritorious, and work credit as earned have been included; projections as to credits to be accrued have not been made in time remaining calculations.<sup>2</sup> Percentage distribution may not add up to 100% due to rounding.<sup>3</sup> This average excludes youthful offenders and inmates with life or death sentences.

FIGURE 25

# REMAINING TIME TO SERVE OF SCDC TOTAL INMATE POPULATION, AS OF JUNE 28, 1980





**TABLE 24**  
**DISTRIBUTION OF TIME SERVED BY SCD C INMATES RELEASED DURING FY 1980**  
**(July 1, 1979 - June 30, 1980)**

Time Served	Male				Female				Total	
	White		Non-White		White		Non-White			
	Number	Percent <sup>1</sup>	Number	Percent <sup>1</sup>	Number	Percent <sup>1</sup>	Number	Percent <sup>1</sup>	Number	Percent <sup>1</sup>
3 months or less .....	217	10.0	225	10.0	31	21.8	21	17.1	494	10.5
3 months 1 day—6 months .....	323	14.8	308	13.7	26	18.3	15	12.2	672	14.3
6 months 1 day—9 months .....	439	20.1	357	15.9	27	19.0	16	13.0	839	17.9
9 months 1 day—12 months .....	218	10.0	209	9.3	21	14.8	16	13.0	464	9.9
1 year 1 day—2 years .....	445	20.4	451	20.1	16	11.3	23	18.7	935	20.0
2 years 1 day—3 years .....	196	9.0	199	8.9	4	2.8	9	7.3	408	8.7
3 years 1 day—4 years .....	136	6.2	181	8.1	9	6.3	11	8.9	337	7.2
4 years 1 day—5 years .....	63	2.9	93	4.1	5	3.5	9	7.3	170	3.6
5 years 1 day—6 years .....	55	2.5	76	3.4	1	0.7	2	1.6	134	2.8
6 years 1 day—7 years .....	23	1.0	50	2.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	73	1.6
7 years 1 day—8 years .....	14	0.6	26	1.2	0	0.0	1	0.8	41	0.9
8 years 1 day—9 years .....	13	0.6	10	0.4	1	0.7	0	0.0	24	0.5
9 years 1 day—10 years .....	10	0.4	9	0.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	19	0.4
10 years 1 day—15 years .....	22	1.0	42	1.9	1	0.7	0	0.0	65	1.4
15 years 1 day—20 years .....	2	0.1	2	0.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	0.1
20 years 1 day—30 years .....	4	0.2	1	0.0 <sup>o</sup>	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	0.1
Over 30 years .....	0	0.0	2	0.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	0.0 <sup>o</sup>
Total Number of Inmates .....	2,180	99.8	2,241	99.7	142	99.9	123	99.9	4,686	99.9
Average Time Served .....	1 yr. 8 mos.		1 yr. 11 mos.		1 yr. 1 mo.		1 yr. 6 mos.		1 yr. 9 mos.	

Source: Division of Resource and Information Management

<sup>1</sup> Percentage distribution may not equal 100% due to rounding.

\* Percentage is less than 0.1%.

FIGURE 26

TIME SERVED BY SCDC INMATES RELEASED DURING FY 1980




TABLE 25

**DISTRIBUTION OF INMATES AND WORK CREDITS EARNED BY TYPE OF RELEASE AND TIME  
SERVED OF INMATES RELEASED DURING FY 1980 (JULY 1, 1979 - JUNE 30, 1980)**

Time Served <sup>1</sup>	YOA Parole		Parole by SSCP&P		Released Less Good Time Expiration) of Sentence)		Placed on Probation		Other Releases <sup>4</sup>		Total Released	
	Number of Inmates	Number of Work Credits Earned	Number of Inmates	Number <sup>2</sup> of Work Credits Earned	Number of Inmates	Number <sup>3</sup> of Work Credits Earned	Number of Inmates	Number <sup>3</sup> of Work Credits Earned	Number of Inmates	Number of Work Credits Earned	Number of Inmates	Number of Work Credits Earned
1 Year or Less . . . . .	618	0	154	7,918	1,126	19,207	350	7,058	221	479	2,469	34,662
1 Yr. 1 Day—2 Yrs. . . . .	200	0	366	30,190	270	19,683	90	5,604	9	387	935	55,864
2 Yrs. 1 Day—3 Yrs. . . . .	30	0	191	19,774	140	13,377	42	4,350	5	368	408	37,869
3 Yrs. 1 Day—4 Yrs. . . . .	42	0	205	21,243	77	5,593	11	570	2	205	337	27,611
4 Yrs. 1 Day—5 Yrs. . . . .	0	0	140	17,157	27	1,838	3	245	0	0	170	19,240
5 Yrs. 1 Day—6 Yrs. . . . .	0	0	111	12,624	20	1,858	2	303	1	163	134	14,948
6 Yrs. 1 Day—7 Yrs. . . . .	0	0	55	6,142	14	1,060	2	235	2	161	73	7,598
7 Yrs. 1 Day—8 Yrs. . . . .	0	0	27	3,171	12	657	1	0	1	14	41	3,842
8 Yrs. 1 Day—9 Yrs. . . . .	0	0	17	2,303	6	522	0	0	1	22	24	2,847
9 Yrs. 1 Day—10 Yrs. . . . .	0	0	15	1,694	4	278	0	0	0	0	19	1,972
10 Yrs. 1 Day—30 Yrs. . . . .	0	0	62	2,511	11	913	0	0	1	0	74	3,424
Over Thirty Years . . . . .	0	0	1	0	1	100	0	0	0	0	2	100
TOTAL . . . . .	890 (19.0%) <sup>5</sup>	05	1,3446 (28.7%) <sup>5</sup>	124,727	1,7087 (36.4%) <sup>5</sup>	65,113	5019 (10.7%) <sup>5</sup>	18,365	2438 (5.2%) <sup>5</sup>	1,799	4,686	210,004
Average Time Served . . . . .	11.4 months		3 yrs. 8 mos.		1 yr. 7 mos.		11.7 mos.		5.4 mos.		1 yr. 9 mos	

Source: Division of Resource and Information Management

<sup>5</sup> Percentage is based on total number of inmates released.

<sup>1</sup> Time served is calculated as the difference between release date and sentence start date.

<sup>2</sup> This is equivalent to the number of days reduced in time served.


<sup>3</sup> Only approximately 7% of the credits earned are equivalent to the number of days reduced in time served because of considerations for statutory and meritorious good time.

<sup>4</sup> Other releases include inmates discharged by court order, released on appeal bond, discharged upon paying fine or died.

<sup>5</sup> Youthful offenders do not earn work credits although they have work assignments.

FIGURE 27

## AVERAGE TIME SERVED BY SCDC INMATES RELEASED DURING FY 1980



**TABLE 26**  
**DISTRIBUTION BY WORK CREDITS EARNED AND TYPE OF**  
**RELEASE OF SCDC INMATES RELEASED DURING FY 1980**  
**(JULY 1, 1979 TO JUNE 30, 1980)**

Work Credits Earned	Type of Release					Total
	YOA Parole	Parole by Probation Parole and Pardon Board	Expiration of Sentence	Placed on Probation	Other Releases <sup>1</sup>	
Not Applicable .....	890 <sup>2</sup>	0	26	6	4	926
0 .....	0	50	364	73	200	
1-50 .....	0	312	818	288	28	1,446
51-100 .....	0	411	302	92	5	810
101-150 .....	0	293	123	26	2	444
151-200 .....	0	170	43	13	4	230
201-250 .....	0	75	13	2	0	90
251-300 .....	0	7	3	1	0	11
301-350 .....	0	3	0	0	0	3
Total Releases .....	890	1,344	1,708	501	243	4,686
Total Work Credits Earned .....	0	124,727	65,113	18,365	1,799	210,004
Average Credits Earned Per Inmate Released <sup>3</sup> .....	0	98.1	50.0	43.5	46.1	..

Source: Division of Resource and Information Management

<sup>1</sup> Other releases include inmates discharged by court order, released on appeal bond, discharged upon paying fine or who died.

<sup>2</sup> Youthful offenders do not earn work credits although they have work assignments.

<sup>3</sup> Inmates who did not participate in the motivational work program and for whom work credits are not applicable are excluded from the computation of these averages.



TABLE 27

**DISTRIBUTION OF AVERAGE DAILY NUMBER OF INMATES AND TOTAL EARNED WORK CREDITS BY JOB ASSIGNMENT DURING FY 1980 (JULY 1, 1979 - JUNE 30, 1980)**

Job Levels/Descriptions	Average Number of Inmates Assigned Per Day During Period						Total Earning Credits*	Total Number of Credits
	Full-Time With Credit	Full-Time No Credit	Part-Time With Credit	Part-Time No Credit	Total Inmates*			
<b>Level 2</b>								
Baker Supervisor .....	17	1	0	0	17	17		2,685
Boiler Room Supervisor .....	3	1	0	0	4	3		393
Butler .....	11	5	0	0	15	11		1,671
Cafeteria Super./Senior Cook .....	88	11	0	0	99	88		14,008
Carpenter Supervisor .....	14	1	0	0	15	14		1,574
Chrman. Inst. Inmate Gr. Comm. ....	2	0	0	0	2	2		211
Chrman., SCDS Inmate Ad. Council .....	3	1	0	0	3	3		293
Design Engineer .....	..	..	..	..	..	..		..
Electrician Supervisor .....	15	1	0	0	15	15		1,963
General Construction Sup. ....	11	2	0	0	12	11		1,098
Grade Supervisor, Ht. & Ac. ....	2	0	0	0	2	2		73
Heat/Air Cond. Supervisor .....	10	2	0	0	11	10		1,217
Industries Grp./Sect. Leader .....	95	13	0	0	107	95		11,437
Inventory Supervisor .....	18	5	0	0	22	18		2,668
Maintenance Supervisor .....	29	4	0	0	33	29		3,870
Mason Supervisor .....	12	0	0	0	12	12		1,333
Material Cutt./Mark Supervisor .....	2	0	0	0	2	2		282
Painter Supervisor .....	8	2	0	0	10	8		901
Plumber Supervisor .....	10	2	0	0	12	10		1,347
Professional Personnel .....	27	4	0	0	30	27		3,474
Senior Wardkeeper .....	49	12	0	0	61	49		7,665
Shop Supervisor .....	10	2	0	0	11	10		1,080

TABLE 27—Continued

**DISTRIBUTION OF AVERAGE DAILY NUMBER OF INMATES AND TOTAL EARNED WORK CREDITS BY JOB ASSIGNMENT DURING FY 1980 (JULY 1, 1979 - JUNE 30, 1980)**

		Average Number of Inmates Assigned Per Day During Period					
Job Levels/Descriptions	Full-Time		Part-Time		Total Inmates*	Total Earning Credits*	Total Number of Credits
	With Credit	No Credit	With Credit	No Credit			
Teacher Assistant Supervisor .....	10	0	0	0	10	10	1,231
Truck Driver, Heavy .....	121	8	0	0	128	121	15,603
Warehouse Supervisor .....	5	2	0	0	6	5	602
Welding Supervisor .....	12	1	0	0	13	12	1,300
Heavy Eq. Operator, Skilled .....	55	5	0	0	59	55	6,791
Heavy Farm Eq. Oper., Skilled .....	8	2	0	0	9	8	1,040
Bindry Supervisor .....	1	0	0	0	1	1	103
Dark Room & Pl. Supervisor .....	1	0	0	0	1	1	116
Press Supervisor .....	2	0	0	0	2	2	128
Typesetter Supervisor .....	1	1	0	0	1	1	57
Litter Control Program .....	54	1	0	0	54	54	6,221
Sanitation Worker .....	14	0	0	0	14	14	1,646
Dog Handler (Skilled) .....	3	0	0	0	3	3	439
Dental Lab. Technician .....	1	1	0	0	1	1	32
Drafter (Professional) .....	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Quality-Control .....	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Sewing Machine Repairer .....	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Work Release .....	501	59	2	0	560	502	55,340
Extended Work Release .....	120	0	0	0	120	120	12,014
Employment Program .....	70	9	0	0	79	70	8,484
Education Release .....	14	1	1	0	14	14	183
Community Transition Service .....	31	1	0	0	31	31	575

Job Levels/Descriptions	Average Number of Inmates Assigned Per Day During Period						
	Full-Time With Credit	Full-Time No Credit	Part-Time With Credit	Part-Time No Credit	Total Inmates*	Total Earning Credits*	Total Number of Credits
Level 3							
Baker	54	3	0	0	56	54	5,384
Barber	13	3	2	2	19	155	1,140
Belt Loader	2	0	0	0	2	2	146
Boiler Maker	1	0	0	0	1	1	110
Boiler Operator	7	4	0	0	10	7	635
Bookkeeper							
Brickmason	35	3	0	0	38	35	2,771
Butcher	13	1	0	0	14	13	1,021
Canteen Operator	38	3	0	0	40	38	3,755
Carpenter	47	5	0	0	52	47	3,712
Chaplain Assistant	18	2	1	0	20	19	1,903
Chief Clerk	66	17	7	1	89	73	5,751
Classroom Leader	16	4	1	1	20	17	1,277
Commissary Operator	15	1	0	0	15	15	1,244
Concrete Finisher	12	0	0	0	12	12	815
Cook	164	8	0	0	171	164	16,528
Custodial Supervisor	28	6	3	2	36	30	2,524
Dining Room Supervisor	16	2	0	0	18	16	1,431
Dip Tank Operator	5	1	0	0	6	5	286
Dog Handler	6	0	0	0	6	6	535
Drafter	3	1	0	0	4	3	212
Driver	63	16	1	0	79	64	5,692
Electrician	33	5	0	0	37	33	2,442
Farm Machine Operator	31	1	1	0	31	31	2,401
Furniture Assembler	19	1	0	0	19	19	1,420
Furniture Repairer	7	1	0	0	7	7	496
Groundskeeper Supervisor	21	5	1	0	26	21	1,820
Hand Tool Repairer	4	0	0	0	4	4	305
Heavy Eq. Operator, Semi-Skilled	16	1	0	0	17	16	1,264

TABLE 27—Continued

**DISTRIBUTION OF AVERAGE DAILY NUMBER OF INMATES AND TOTAL EARNED WORK CREDITS BY JOB ASSIGNMENT DURING FY 1980 (JULY 1, 1979 - JUNE 30, 1980)**

Job Levels/Descriptions	Average Number of Inmates Assigned Per Day During Period						Total Earning Credits*	Total Number of Credits
	Full-Time With Credit	Full-Time No Credit	Part-Time With Credit	Part-Time No Credit	Total Inmates*			
Housekeeper .....	37	4	0	0	41	37	3,441	
Instrument Fitter .....	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Insulator .....	3	0	0	0	3	3	225	
Inventory Clerk .....	19	3	2	0	22	20	1,484	
Ironworker .....	5	1	0	0	5	5	252	
License Tag Quality Control Op. ....	3	3	0	0	5	3	165	
Livestock Caretaker .....	33	2	0	0	34	33	3,270	
Locksmith .....	2	0	0	0	2	2	130	
Machine Operator .....	92	14	10	4	118	102	7,434	
Material Cutter/Maker .....	3	1	0	1	3	3	164	
Material Handling Eq. Op. ....	4	1	0	0	4	4	257	
Meat Cutter .....	13	0	0	0	13	13	989	
Mechanic .....	59	5	0	0	63	59	4,733	
Medical Assistant .....	2	0	0	0	2	2	26	
Milking Machine Operator .....	7	0	0	0	7	7	757	
Milk Processor .....	9	0	0	0	9	9	899	
Millwright .....	1	0	0	0	1	1	16	
Painter .....	42	3	0	0	44	42	3,378	
Pattern Maker .....	1	0	0	0	1	1	10	
Photographer .....	2	0	0	0	2	2	84	
Pipe Fitter .....	11	1	0	0	11	11	812	
Plumber .....	31	3	0	0	33	31	2,491	
Print Machine Operator .....	4	0	0	0	4	4	316	
Radio Dispatcher .....	17	2	0	0	19	17	1,518	

Average Number of Inmates Assigned Per Day During Period							
Job Levels/Descriptions	Full-Time With Credit	Full-Time No Credit	Part-Time With Credit	Part-Time No Credit	Total Inmates*	Total Earning Credits*	Total Number of Credits
Recreation Assistant .....	16	4	5	0	25	21	1,563
Roofer .....	8	2	0	0	9	8	574
Safety Security Clerk .....	2	1	0	0	3	2	139
Secretary .....	0	1	0	0	1	0	..
Shipping & Receiving Clerk .....	16	2	0	0	18	16	1,094
Silk Screen Operator .....	2	1	0	0	2	2	94
Storekeeper .....	10	2	0	0	11	10	728
Switchboard Operator .....	9	2	0	1	10	9	755
Teacher Assistant .....	39	5	15	4	62	54	3,564
Tier Keeper .....	15	1	0	0	16	15	1,435
Timekeeper .....	1	0	0	0	1	1	55
Tray Line Supervisor .....	13	2	0	0	14	13	1,399
Typesetter .....	0	1	0	0	1	0	..
Upholsterer .....	12	1	0	0	12	12	876
Vegetable Preparation Supervisor .....	2	0	0	0	2	2	166
Wardkeeper .....	73	9	1	0	82	73	7,299
Warehouse, Assistant Supervisor .....	3	1	0	0	4	3	140
Waste Treatment Super. ....	3	0	0	0	3	3	213
Welder .....	24	1	0	0	25	24	1,870
Litter Control Pg. Part .....	13	1	0	0	14	13	1,076
Landscaper/Gardener .....	0	1	0	0	1	0	..
Sandblaster .....	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Dental Lab. Tech., Skilled .....	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Laminator .....	5	2	0	0	6	5	378
Para-Professional Counselor, Skilled .....	5	0	0	0	5	5	479
Hort. Spec. Grower, Inside .....	7	0	0	0	7	7	571
Dental Lab. Tech., Skilled .....	3	2	0	0	4	3	193



TABLE 27—Continued

## DISTRIBUTION OF AVERAGE DAILY NUMBER OF INMATES AND TOTAL EARNED WORK CREDITS BY JOB ASSIGNMENT DURING FY 1980 (JULY 1, 1979 - JUNE 30, 1980)

Job Levels/Descriptions	Average Number of Inmates Assigned Per Day During Period						Total Earning Credits*	Total Number of Credits
	Full-Time With Credit	Full-Time No Credit	Part-Time With Credit	Part-Time No Credit	Total Inmates*			
<b>Level 5</b>								
Barber Apprentice .....	13	1	1	1	16	14	577	
Boilermaker Helper .....	0	0	0	1	1	0	..	
Boiler Operator Helper .....	5	2	0	0	7	5	184	
Brickmason Helper .....	22	7	2	0	30	23	965	
Canteen Operator Helper .....	10	3	0	0	12	10	464	
Carpenter Helper .....	30	2	1	0	33	31	1,391	
Commissary Oper. Helper .....	7	1	0	0	7	7	235	
Concrete Finisher Helper .....	2	0	0	0	2	2	29	
Dairy Helper .....	16	4	0	0	19	16	904	
Dip Tank Operator Helper .....	2	0	0	0	2	2	68	
Drafter Helper .....	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	
Electrician Helper .....	19	4	2	0	24	21	882	
Furniture Assembler .....	9	2	0	0	11	9	363	
Furniture Repair Helper .....	26	2	0	0	27	26	1,092	
Gate Attendant .....	12	1	1	0	13	12	492	
Hauler .....	32	3	0	0	35	32	1,411	
Heavy Eq. Operator Helper .....	8	1	0	0	8	8	352	
Instrument Fitter Helper .....	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	
Insulator Helper .....	1	0	0	0	1	1	22	
Ironworker Helper .....	1	1	0	0	1	1	24	
Laminator Helper .....	4	1	0	0	4	4	156	
Laundry Helper .....	37	11	3	0	50	39	1,732	
Laundry Room Attendant .....	68	13	0	0	81	68	3,420	

Job Levels/Descriptions	Average Number of Inmates Assigned Per Day During Period						Total Earning Credits*	Total Number of Credits
	Full-Time With Credit	Full-Time No Credit	Part-Time With Credit	Part-Time No Credit	Total Inmates*			
Library Helper .....	12	3	1	0	15	13		576
Licen Tag Qu. Ctl. Op. Hlp. ....	1	1	0	0	1	1		2
Livestock Caretaker Helper .....	12	1	0	0	13	12		601
Locksmith Helper .....	0	1	0	0	1	0		..
Machine Operator Helper .....	10	2	1	1	13	10		331
Mailroom Clerk .....	2	3	0	0	4	2		55
Material Cut./Mark. Helper .....	1	0	0	0	1	1		38
Mechanic Helper .....	43	3	3	0	48	45		1,864
Medical Orderly .....	12	2	0	0	13	12		625
Millwright Helper .....	..	..	..	..	..	..		..
Night Watchman/Clockman .....	2	0	0	0	2	2		88
Office Clerk .....	21	8	0	0	28	21		894
Painter Helper .....	15	3	0	0	18	15		746
Para-Professional Counselor .....	2	0	0	0	2	2		99
Pattern Maker Helper .....	..	..	..	..	..	..		..
Pipe Fitter Helper .....	9	2	0	0	10	9		406
Plumber Helper .....	19	3	0	0	21	19		898
Printing Machine Op. Helper .....	2	0	1	0	2	2		21
Receptionist .....	..	..	..	..	..	..		..
Recreation Aide .....	8	1	1	0	9	9		430
Roofer Helper .....	7	2	0	0	8	7		262
Safety Hat Control Clerk .....	1	0	0	0	1	1		37
Service Station Attendant .....	7	2	0	0	8	7		376
Ship. & Receiving Clerk Helper .....	3	3	0	0	6	3		119
Silk Screen Operator Helper .....	1	1	0	0	1	1		20
Stock Clerk .....	7	2	0	0	8	7		265
Supply Clerk .....	6	1	0	0	7	6		348
Teacher Aide .....	31	8	1	2	41	32		1,416
Tier Keeper Assistant .....	5	2	0	0	7	5		313

TABLE 27—Continued

## DISTRIBUTION OF AVERAGE DAILY NUMBER OF INMATES AND TOTAL EARNED WORK CREDITS BY JOB ASSIGNMENT DURING FY 1980 (JULY 1, 1979 - JUNE 30, 1980)

Average Number of Inmates Assigned Per Day During Period							
Job Levels/Descriptions	Full-Time With Credit	Full-Time No Credit	Part-Time With Credit	Part-Time No Credit	Total Inmates*	Total Earning Credits*	Total Number of Credits
Tool Clerk .....	3	1	3	0	6	6	150
Typesetter Helper .....	..	..	..	..	..	..	863
Upholster Helper .....	20	2	0	0	22	20	6,559
Wardkeeper Assistant .....	103	11	4	4	120	106	464
Warehouse Attendant .....	12	3	0	0	15	12	90
Waste Treatment Assistant .....	2	0	0	0	2	2	890
Welder Helper .....	22	5	1	0	27	23	161
Auto Body Repair Helper .....	4	2	1	0	5	4	100
Electronics Repair Helper .....	3	0	0	0	3	3	459
Custodial Attdn., State House .....	11	3	0	0	13	11	315
Custodial Attdn., Gov. Mansion .....	8	3	0	0	10	8	221
Custodial Attdn., Visiting Room .....	5	0	0	0	5	5	141
Admin. Runner/Messenger .....	6	0	1	0	6	6	21,752
Food Service Aide .....	466	54	6	3	525	422	..
Custodian Helper .....	1	0	0	0	1	1	..
Sander .....	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Level 7							
Clerk Helper .....	3	2	0	0	4	3	40
Construction Worker .....	9	1	0	2	10	9	253
Custodial Worker .....	284	48	69	46	446	353	11,678
Elevator Operator .....	1	1	0	0	2	1	27
Farm Worker .....	60	4	0	0	63	60	1,760
Garment Worker .....	1	0	0	0	1	1	17

Job Levels/Descriptions	Average Number of Inmates Assigned Per Day During Period						Total Earning Credits*	Total Number of Credits
	Full-Time With Credit	Full-Time No Credit	Part-Time With Credit	Part-Time No Credit	Total Inmates*			
General Worker .....	287	42	45	59	431	331		9,326
Horticulture Trainee .....	15	2	1	0	17	15		392
Industries Trainee .....	42	7	0	0	48	42		1,163
Laundry Worker .....	34	14	0	0	47	34		996
Machine Operator Trainee .....	4	1	3	3	10	6		121
Road Maintenance Worker .....	204	3	0	0	206	204		6,075
Runner/Messenger .....	14	8	0	0	21	14		479
Sanitation Worker .....	41	0	0	0	41	41		1,277
Wash Rack Attendant .....	5	0	1	0	5	5		173
Auto Body Repair Trainee .....	10	2	5	4	20	15		336
Construction Trainee .....	38	4	7	7	55	44		1,247
Electrician Trainee .....	23	1	1	0	24	23		742
Electronic Repair Trainee .....	9	0	1	0	9	9		293
Heavy Eq. Mechanic Trainee .....	9	0	1	0	9	9		276
Heavy Eq. Operator Trainee .....	10	1	1	0	11	10		317
Mechanic Trainee .....	2	2	3	6	11	5		96
Welder Trainee .....	16	4	5	3	26	20		497
Dental Lab. Tech. Trainee .....	..	..	..	..	..	..		..
Landscape Laborer .....	1	1	0	0	1	1		41
<b>TOTAL .....</b>	<b>5,246</b>	<b>683</b>	<b>230</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>6,317</b>	<b>5,476</b>		<b>390,959</b>

Source: Division of Resource and Information Management

\* Because of rounding, these two columns may not be exactly the total or subtotal of the previous columns.

**TABLE 28**  
**PAROLE BOARD ACTION <sup>1</sup> DURING FISCAL YEAR 1980**


Inmate Location	Number Considered	Number Paroled			Percent Paroled		
		Parole	Provisional Parole	Total	Parole	Provisional Parole	Total
Work Release Centers .....	508	387	24	411	76%	5%	81%
Maximum/Medium Custody Institutions .....	710	157	132	289	22%	18%	40%
Minimum Custody Institutions .....	645	263	127	390	41%	20%	61%
Women .....	93	59	11	70	63%	12%	75%
Designated County Facilities .....	240	116	50	166	48%	21%	69%
TOTAL .....	2,196	982	344	1,326	45%	16%	61%

Source: SCDC's Statistical Report, July 1, 1979-June 30, 1980

<sup>1</sup> This table represents the outcome of parole hearings held by the South Carolina Probation, Parole and Pardon Board during the fiscal year and does not include youthful offenders paroled by the Division of Classification and Community Services.



# PERCENTAGES OF SCDC INMATES GRANTED PAROLE BY QUARTER (JANUARY, 1977 - JUNE, 1980)



<sup>1</sup> This is based on the number of inmates considered for parole by the South Carolina Probation, Parole and Pardon Board and does not include youthful offenders.

**TABLE 29**  
**COMMUNITY PROGRAM STATISTICS, FY 1980 (July 1, 1979 - June 30, 1980)**

	Community Programs			
	30-Day Pre-Release Program <sup>1</sup>	Employment Program <sup>1</sup>	120-Day Accelerated Work Release, Regular Work Release, Work-Study Release, Federal Referral Program <sup>1</sup>	Extended Work Release Program <sup>1</sup>
<b>Inmate Flows</b>				
Participants in Program at Beginning .....	121	76	530	144
Admitted During Fiscal Year .....	2,142	148	1,917	344
Total Loss During Fiscal Year .....	2,115	126	1,828	368
Dismissed .....	90	3	364	82
Released .....	1,134	N/A <sup>2</sup>	714	132
Paroled .....	278	1	321	154
Transferred to Other Programs .....	613	122	429	0
Participants in Program at End .....	148	98	619	120
<b>Financial Statistics</b>				
Total Salaries Paid .....	N/A <sup>2</sup>	627,864.98	4,226,860.75	908,142.16
Disbursed to Inmates .....	N/A <sup>2</sup>	243,353.50	1,602,425.54	N/A <sup>2</sup>
Disbursed to Dependents .....	N/A <sup>2</sup>	95,557.74	653,601.84	N/A <sup>2</sup>
Income to South Carolina Department of Corrections .....	N/A <sup>2</sup>	135,482.12	1,012,239.81	118,732.00

Source: Division of Human Services' Monthly Reports to the Board of Corrections, July, 1979 - June, 1980

<sup>1</sup> Please see Section IV of the Glossary for details of these Programs.

<sup>2</sup> Not applicable.

**TABLE 30**  
**YOUTHFUL OFFENDER STATISTICS**  
**Fiscal Years 1979 and 1980**

	Fiscal Year 1979	Fiscal Year 1980	Absolute Change	Per- centage Change
Total YOA Admissions .....	1,127	1,157	30	2.7
5b's <sup>1</sup> .....	127	130	3	2.4
5c's <sup>1</sup> .....	1,000	1,027	27	2.7
5d's <sup>1</sup> .....	0	0	..	..
Total YOA Releases .....	918	984	66	7.2
Conditional <sup>2</sup> .....	852	896	44	5.2
Unconditional <sup>3</sup> .....	66	88	22	33.3
Total Number Under Supervision at End of Fiscal Year .....	2,221	2,448	227	10.2
Number Incarcerated at End of Fiscal Year .....	849	933	84	9.9
5b's .....	37	25	-12	-32.4
5c's .....	812	908	96	11.8
5d's .....	0	0	..	..
Number of Conditional Releasees Under Supervision at End of Fiscal Year .....	1,372	1,515	143	10.4

**TABLE 31**  
**DISTRIBUTION OF SCDC PERSONNEL BY**  
**RACE AND SEX, AS OF JUNE 19, 1980**

	Male		Female		Total
	White	Non-White	White	Non-White	
Security Personnel <sup>1</sup> . . . . .	407	433	75	115	1,030
Non-Security Personnel . . . . .	407	149	262	96	914
SCDC TOTAL . . . . .	814	582	337	211	1,944

Source: Division of Resource and Information Management

<sup>1</sup>Security personnel include all uniformed personnel: correctional officers, correctional officer assistant supervisors, correctional officer supervisors, and chief correctional officers supervisors.

**FIGURE 29**  
**SCDC PERSONNEL BY RACE, SEX AND**  
**TYPE OF POSITION, AS OF JUNE 19, 1980**




TABLE 32

## DISTRIBUTION OF SCDC SECURITY STRENGTH BY FACILITY, As of June 19, 1980

Facilities	Number of Correctional Officers Authorized	Number of Correctional Officers Actually Assigned			Average Inmate Population	Number of Inmates Per Authorized Correctional Officer
		Male	Female	Total		
Appalachian Correctional Region .....	163	133	26	159	1,194	7.3
Appalachian Reception and Evaluation Ctr. ....	27	19	7	26	99	3.7
Blue Ridge Work Release/Pre-Release Ctr. ....	11	9	2	11	222	20.2
Cherokee Correctional Center .....	11	10	1	11	72	6.5
Duncan Correctional Center .....	12	10	1	11	53	4.4
Givens Youth Correction Center .....	13	11	2	13	127	9.8
Greenwood Correctional Center .....	14	10	3	13	90	6.4
Hillcrest Correctional Center .....	11	9	1	10	111	10.1
Laurens Correctional Center .....	13	11	2	13	52	4.0
Northside Correctional Center .....	12	10	2	12	48	4.0
Oaklawn Correctional Center .....	14	13	1	14	117	8.4
Piedmont Work Release Center .....	9	7	2	9	114	12.7
Travelers Rest Correctional Center .....	13	11	2	13	89	6.8
Regional Training and Transportation Office ....	3	3	0	3	..	..
Midlands Correctional Region .....	755	600	148	748	4,917	6.5
Aiken Youth Correction Center .....	33	23	10	33	211	6.4
Campbell Work Release Center .....	11	10	1	11	159	14.4
Catawba Work Release Center .....	8	6	2	8	88	11.0
Central Correctional Institution .....	272	224	26	250	1,681	6.2
Employment Program Dorm .....	8	6	2	8	63	7.9
Goodman Correctional Institution .....	14	11	3	14	101	7.2
Kirkland Correctional Institution .....	159	143	25	168	1,102	6.9
Lexington Correctional Center .....	12	10	2	12	86	7.2
Lower Savannah Work Release Center .....	6	3	2	5	61	10.2
Manning Correctional Institution .....	59	50	8	58	449	7.6



**TABLE 32—Continued**  
**DISTRIBUTION OF SCDC SECURITY STRENGTH BY FACILITY, As of June 19, 1980**

Facilities	Number of Correctional Officers Authorized	Number of Correctional Officers Actually Assigned			Average Inmate Population	Number of Inmates Per Authorized Correctional Officer
		Male	Female	Total		
Maximum Security Center .....	30	30	0	30	92	3.1
Midlands Reception and Evaluation Center .....	34	35	2	37	129	3.8
Walden Correctional Institution .....	16	15	5	20	190	11.9
Watkins Pre-Release Center .....	21	19	3	22	177	8.4
Women's Correctional Center .....	64	13	51	64	256	4.0
Women's Work Release Dorm .....	6	1	5	6	72	12.0
Regional Training and Transportation Office .....	2	1	1	2		
Coastal Correctional Region .....	97	87	11	98	1,118	11.5
Coastal Work Release Center .....	8	6	2	8	98	12.2
MacDougall Youth Correction Center .....	36	37	1	38	423	11.8
Palmer Work Release Center .....	8	6	2	8	116	14.5
Wateree River Correctional Institution .....	45	38	6	44	481	10.7
<b>TOTAL SCDC FACILITIES .....</b>	<b>1,015<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>820</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>1,005<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>7,229</b>	<b>7.1</b>

Source: Division of Personnel Administration

<sup>1</sup> This date is closest to the end of the period in which information for developing this table is available.

<sup>2</sup> This number excludes 16 authorized for the State Park Health Center, 2 for the Division of Construction, 6 for the Criminal Justice Academy, and 3 for the Get Smart Team.

<sup>3</sup> This number excludes 15 assigned to State Park Health Center, 1 for the Division of Construction, 7 for the Criminal Justice Academy, and 1 for the Get Smart Team.

## APPENDIX

- A. Statutory Authority of the South Carolina Department of Corrections
- B. Youthful Offender Act
- C. Programs and Services Administered by the South Carolina Department of Corrections
- D. Counties Comprising South Carolina Planning Districts and Correctional Regions
- E. Counties Comprising South Carolina Judicial Circuits

## A. STATUTORY AUTHORITY OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

The South Carolina Department of Corrections was created in 1960 by Section 55-292, South Carolina Code of Laws as follows: "There is hereby created as an administrative agency of the State government the Department of Corrections. The functions of the Department shall be to implement and carry out the policy of the State with respect to its prison system, as set forth in 55-291, and the performance of such other duties and matters as may be delegated to it pursuant to Law."

Section 55-291 as referred to in Section 55-292 sets out the Declaration of Policy as follows: "It shall be the policy of this State in the operation and management of the Department of Corrections to manage and conduct the Department in such a manner as will be consistent with the operation of a modern prison system and with the view of making the system self-sustaining, and that those convicted of violating the law and sentenced to a term in the State Penitentiary shall have humane treatment, and be given opportunity, encouragement and training in the matter of reformation."

Further significant statutory authority was provided the Department by Section 14, Part II, the permanent provisions of the 1974-75 General Appropriations Act which was signed on June 28, 1974. Section 14 is, in effect, an amendment of Section 55-321 and places all prisoners convicted of an offense against the State in the custody of the Department when their sentences exceed three months. The text of the statute is as follows:

"Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 55-321 of the 1962 Code, or any other provision of law, any person convicted of an offense against the State of South Carolina shall be in the custody of the Board of Corrections of the State of South Carolina, and the Board shall designate the place of confinement where the sentence shall be served. The Board may designate as a place of confinement any available, suitable and appropriate institution or facility, including a county jail or work camp whether maintained by the State Department of Corrections or otherwise, but the consent of the officials in charge of the county institutions so designated shall be first obtained. Provided, that if imprisonment for three months or less is ordered by the court as the punishment, all persons so convicted shall be placed in the custody, supervision and

control of the appropriate officials of the county wherein the sentence was pronounced, if such county has facilities suitable for confinement.”

This statute was amended by an added provision in the 1975-76 General Appropriations Act to provide for notification to the Department of Corrections of the closing of county prison facilities as follows: “Section 14, Part II, of Act 1136 of 1974 is amended by adding the following proviso at the end thereof: Provided, further, that the Department of Corrections shall be notified by the county officials concerned not less than six months prior to the closing of any county prison facility which would result in the transfer of the prisoners of the county facility to facilities of the Department.”

### **B. YOUTHFUL OFFENDER ACT**

The Youthful Offender Act provides for indeterminate sentencing of offenders between the ages of 17 and 21, extended to 25 with offender consent. The specific provisions of the Act are as follows:

Section 5b—This section allows the court to release the youthful offender to the custody of the Department’s Division of Classification and Community Services prior to sentencing for an observation and evaluation period of not more than 60 days.

Section 5c—This section allows the court to sentence the youthful offender, between 17 and 21, without his consent, indefinitely to the custody of the Department’s Division of Classification and Community Services for treatment and supervision until discharge. The period of such custody will not exceed six years. If the offender has reached 21 years of age but is less than 25 years of age, he may be sentenced in accordance with the above procedure if he consents hereto in writing.

Section 5d—This section provides that if the court finds that the youthful offender will not derive benefits from treatment, it may sentence the youthful offender under any other applicable provision.

## C. PROGRAMS AND SERVICES ADMINISTERED BY THE SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

### RESPONSIBLE DIVISION

### PROGRAM AREA/ACTIVITY

Human Services

Title I Supplementary Educational Services; Adult Basic Education and other Educational Services in accordance with Public Law 94-142; Vocational Education; Post Secondary Education Program; Pastoral Care Services; Library Services; Psychological Services; Special Learning Unit; Recreational Services; Residential Institutional Therapeutic Community; Horticulture Program; CETA Transition Services; Morris Village and Alston Wilkes Community Halfway House Furlough Programs; SCDC/S. C. Department of Vocational Rehabilitation Inter-Agency Contact; Arts Commission Intra-Agency Contract.

Health Services

Medical/Dental Sick Call; General Surgery; Orthopedic Surgery; Internal Medicine; Psychiatric Services; Optometry Services; Referral Services.

Classification and  
Community Services

Classification and Assignment; Work Release; Extended Work Release; 30-Day Pre-Release; 120 Day Accelerated Work Release; Youthful Offender Referrals; Educational Release; Federal Offender Referrals; Employment Program; Economic Development Pilot Program; Provisional Parolees Referrals; Inmate Furlough; Casework; Pre-sentence Investigation; Institutional Services; Parole and Aftercare Services for Youthful Offenders.

Inmate Relations

Interview inmates in regard to grievances; represent inmates in cases involving infractions of rules; resolution of inmate grievances; represent inmates who appear before institutional adjustment committees.



## D. COUNTIES COMPRISING SOUTH CAROLINA PLANNING DISTRICTS AND CORRECTIONAL REGIONS

### APPALACHIAN CORRECTIONAL REGION

#### Planning District I (Appalachian)

Anderson  
Cherokee  
Greenville  
Oconee  
Pickens  
Spartanburg

#### Planning District II (Upper Savannah)

Abbeville  
Edgefield  
Greenwood  
Laurens  
McCormick  
Saluda

### MIDLANDS CORRECTIONAL REGION

#### Planning District III (Catawba)

Chester  
Lancaster  
Union  
York

#### Planning District IV (Central Midlands)

Fairfield  
Lexington  
Newberry  
Richland

#### Planning District V (Lower Savannah)

Aiken  
Allendale  
Bamberg  
Calhoun  
Orangeburg

#### Planning District VI (Santee-Wateree)

Clarendon  
Kershaw  
Lee  
Sumter

#### Planning District VII (Pee Dee)

Chesterfield  
Darlington  
Dillon  
Florence  
Marion  
Marlboro

### COASTAL CORRECTIONAL REGION

#### Planning District VIII (Waccamaw)

Georgetown  
Horry  
Williamsburg

#### Planning District IX (Berkeley-Charleston-Dorchester)

Berkeley  
Charleston  
Dorchester

#### Planning District X (Low Country)

Beaufort  
Colleton  
Hampton  
Jasper

## E. COUNTIES COMPRISING SOUTH CAROLINA JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

Judicial Circuit #1	Judicial Circuit #9
Calhoun	Charleston
Dorchester	Berkeley
Orangeburg	
Judicial Circuit #2	Judicial Circuit #10
Aiken	Anderson
Bamberg	Oconee
Barnwell	
Judicial Circuit #3	Judicial Circuit #11
Clarendon	Edgefield
Lee	Lexington
Sumter	McCormick
Williamsburg	Saluda
Judicial Circuit #4	Judicial Circuit #12
Chesterfield	Florence
Darlington	Marion
Dillon	
Marlboro	Judicial Circuit #13
	Greenville
Judicial Circuit #5	Pickens
Kershaw	Judicial Circuit #14
Richland	Allendale
	Beaufort
Judicial Circuit #6	Colleton
Chester	Hampton
Fairfield	Jasper
Lancaster	
Judicial Circuit #7	Judicial Circuit #15
Cherokee	Georgetown
Spartanburg	Horry
Judicial Circuit #8	Judicial Circuit #16
Abbeville	Union
Greenwood	York
Laurens	
Newberry	

